This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

NATURE,

MAN, AND GOD:

A Contribution to the Scientific Teaching of To-day.

BY

THE REV. JOHN M. WILSON.

London:
W. SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO.,
PATERNOSTER SQUARE.
1885.

26599

Digitized by Google

BODLEIAN LIBRARY
15 DEC 85
OXFORD.

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

THIS treatise, as originally written, included two long chapters on Revelation and the Bible, and was designed, as a whole, to show that the works and the word of God have one voice. But the chapters on Revelation and the Bible are so mainly a sequel to the others, and have so much separate scope of their own, that they are now placed aside for separate publication.

J. M. W.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

NATURE.—Meanings of the word Nature. General view of Nature. The evolution theory; its alleged facts respecting the imponderables, respecting chemical atoms, respecting protoplasm, and respecting primary cells; its materialism, mechanicalism, and self-confutation. The development theory; its pleas from oneness of plan, from gradation of species, and from ascension of species; its antagonism to the facts of mind and moral government; its debasing corollaries. General views identifying Nature with God, as to creation only; as a synonym for the word "God;" as a synonym for the phrase "works of God;" as to natural religion; as to the Divine moral government. Special views of Nature, as to the original state of man; as to the alleged unperverted state of man; as to the native state of physical things; as to the native moral state of fallen man; as to the renovated state of man 1

Digitized by Google

PAGE

CHAPTER II.

THE SUPERNATURAL.—Meanings of the word Supernatural. Nine wrong uses of the word. Use of it in the sense of contrary to natural laws. Explanation of these laws, as forces. Control over the forces. How the forces are invariable and permanent. Adjustment or combination of forces. Relation of forces to special creations, to special providence, to miracles, to moral miracles, and to revelation 103

CHAPTER III.

CREATION.—Theories of the world's origin. The primal world made by God out of nothing. Progression in the world's formation. Special creations. Connexion of creation with the mediatorial reign. How that reign is to be understood. Universality of it in both space and time. Future duration and end of the world. How the Deity is revealed on earth. Import of the name Jehovah. Relations of the pre-Adamite world to the mediatorial reign. Why the pre-Adamite animals were subject to death. Preparation of the earth, from the beginning onward, for man. Connexion of creation with the Sabbath and with Sabbatism 151

CHAPTER IV.

PROVIDENCE.—The doctrine of Providence explained. Eight objections to it examined. Seven abuses of it exposed. A series of proofs of it illustrated 238

Digitized by Google

PAGE

CHAPTER V.

MANKIND.—The questions here regard Man only in his relative place among the works of the Creator; how these are to be discussed as between Scripture and science. The origin of Man as announced in the Bible, and as treated by sceptics; the antiquity of Man as deduced by most Christian writers from the Bible; as supposed by a few Christians to be pre-Adamite; as contended by many savants to be very remote. Eighteen alleged facts for the very remote antiquity, and a series of arguments against it. The unity of the human race, argued from their intellectuality, from their faculty of speech, from their original equipment for every purpose of art and science, from their very physical varieties, and from their common capacity for the common salvation. Man's original condition in art, science, and religion. Five wrong opinions and the right one as to what civilization is. The civilized state of Adam, of the Antediluvians, of the descendants of Noah, and of the Ancient Hebrews. Pristine civilization argued from the inertness of savageism, from the difference between brute instinct and human intellect, from the relation of instruction to civilized practice, from the prominence of true religion over science and art, from the mental and moral condition of savages, from the physical condition of savages, from the traditions of all ancient civilized nations, from the general history of civilization, from the history of each of the elements of civilization, from the history of each of the most remarkable of the civilized nations, and from the verdict of the most distinguished ethnologists 271

Digitized by Google

PAGE

CHAPTER VI.

MIRACLES.—Variety and conflict in definition of miracles. The Bible's account of them. They were very diversified. Various classes of them specified and illustrated. All were done directly by God. Lying wonders only were ever done by any creatures. All miracles were done in connexion with the reign of Christ, to unfold, attest, or enforce the truth of revelation. The several chief ones illustrated in that view. True miracles exhibited in a series of contrasts to counterfeits. Hume's argument against them examined. They were a necessity for man, and concurrent with revelation 411

Digitized by Google

THE SUPREME POWER.

CHAPTER I.

NATURE.

Meanings of the word Nature. General view of Nature. The evolution theory; its alleged facts respecting the imponderables, respecting chemical atoms, respecting protoplasm, and respecting primary cells; its materialism, mechanicalism, and self-confutation. The development theory; its pleas from oneness of plan, from gradation of species, and from ascension of species; its antagonism to the facts of mind and moral government; its debasing corollaries. General views identifying Nature with God, as to creation only; as a synonym for the word "God;" as a synonym for the phrase "works of God;" as to natural religion; as to the Divine moral government. Special views of Nature, as to the original state of man; as to the alleged unperverted state of man; as to the native state of physical things; as to the native moral state of fallen man; as to the renovated state of man.

WHAT is Nature? Can you need to be told? Many religious writers speak of it; some philosophers discuss it; multitudes of literary works, on a great variety of subjects, freely mention it; nearly all persons, of all creeds and classes, currently speak of it. Mankind would almost seem to think about it by a common

Digitized by Google

consent, just as they think about the sun. The meaning of the word Nature, therefore, might appear to be as settled and uniform as the meaning of the words light and heat. But is it so? *Exceedingly*, the reverse. Scarcely any ordinary word has so many different meanings; and no ordinary word has meanings more distant from one another, or completely opposite. The meanings of the word, as it is used by various persons or in various connexions, actually range from creatures to the Creator, from a property in minerals to the omnipotence of Deity, from nothing to God. Nor do these meanings pass away in sound, or perish with paper; but they powerfully affect men's beliefs, their actions, and their entire well-being.

I. The most prominent meanings are such as may be called general. These identify Nature with the creative power. They regard it as the creator of the world. They ascribe to it, either expressly or constructively, self-existence, omnipotence, omniscience, and infinite wisdom. They, nevertheless, are of many grades. Some restrict it to the work of primal creation; some regard it as also having made provision for all the future; and some extend it into permanent active providence. Yet they range themselves into two completely opposite kinds; the one essentially infidel, the other less or more religious; the former constructively making Nature to be nothing, the latter identifying it less or more with God. But each kind, or any grade of each kind, often is indistinctly exhibited by individual writers; and the two kinds are not unfrequently fused into each other by different writers, sometimes even by the same writer. Few efforts of discriminating readers are more difficult than to give the views distinct classifi-

Digitized by Google

cation; to separate always the infidel kind from the religious; to say exactly, in reading some one writer or some one group of writers, when he is speaking virtually about nothing, and when he is speaking consciously about God. Writers, either individually or in classes, often lose themselves in their own theories; often unsay at one time what they have said at another; often speak in turns as if creation was made nohow, as if it made itself, as if it was made by an Infinite Intelligent Being. Little purpose is served by classifying their notions into atheism, pantheism, materialism, deism, and theism. These terms, though not so indefinite as the term Nature, are far from definite enough to separate theory from theory, or to draw a line, among their tortuous arguments, between fallacy and fact. The one test which tries them, throughout the multitudes of their statements respecting what they call the works of Nature, is to bring them to say roundly and plainly, in regard to each one of the works separately, Is it or was it the work of God or not? Apply that test rigidly and constantly, and then you will see what they mean by "Nature." And when you find, in any instance, that what they call Nature is not God, you easily push them to say what it is, or at least to give you a round of evasions excusing themselves from saying what it is; and you soon discover that they constructively make it to be nothing.

We need not, then, single out individual writers, to criticise or combat them. We should have an endless task, and a bootless one, to examine them all, or even to examine the chief. Nor should we accomplish much by examining even two or three of the most prominent. Any searching criticism of one would be a tedious

Digitized by Google

business, and would have little effect on the others. Finely blown theories, far lighter than soap-bubbles, because without a particle of substance, are the principal things to be observed and crushed, and these might be chased to their end by the dozen, only to be followed by as many more. What one writer says, in the way of alleged proof, another does not *homologate*. Each writer has his own line of theory, his own line of illustration; and as many writers as can be said to form a class agree only on some general principle to be maintained, and on the general conclusion to be reached. We, therefore, will not go into controversy with individual writers; will not use the hard Greek terms which some of them have invented to denote their new theories; will not select for criticism the precise expressions or the special arguments used by any of them; will merely aim to conduct such an examination as shall expose their views in the gross; and, in following out that aim, will studiously endeavour both to represent the views with perfect fairness in respect to the persons holding them, and to examine them in the way most simple and most useful in respect to our readers.

Two general theories or groups of theory, then, are before us; the one essentially infidel, the other *less* or *more* religious; the former constructively making Nature to be nothing, the latter identifying it less or more with God; and, though often written about and spoken of as one general theory under one name, they really are quite distinct from each other, and require to be designated respectively the evolution theory and the development theory. We also must distinguish both of them from other general views which identify Nature with God; and we therefore shall here discuss, first, the

Digitized by Google

evolution theory; secondly, the development theory; and thirdly, those other general views.

1. The Evolution Theory. The persons who hold this do not say that Nature is nothing; they, on the contrary, use terms respecting it which logically ascribe to it both creative and previsive power; but they so explain away these terms or employ them with such accompaniments or in such connexions as, after all, to make Nature to be nothing. They regard the origin of things as having been entirely material, surpassingly crude, and negatively self-existent; they ascribe all subsequent things to a mechanical process of evolving later things from earlier ones; and they call both the origin and the process Nature. They avoid speaking about the origin, evade questions about it, and give all their strength to the exposition of the process. Nor do they speak plainly even about that, but exhibit it in a cloud of theories, behind a great forest of alleged facts. Neither their theories nor their alleged facts can be stated within moderate compass; but their views, as displayed in these, and as seen apart from the intricacies of the theories, may be summarily stated as follows:—All minerals, plants, and animals, from the crudest existing thing up to man, originated in pristine atoms or infinitesimal particles. These atoms, by cohesion or otherwise, formed the first minerals, gaseous, liquid, or solid, from the most elementary onward to the most complicated. The same atoms, in themselves or through the minerals, and afterwards through vegetable organization, formed the first plants, from the simplest cryptogam onward to the most complex exogen. The same atoms, in themselves or through the minerals and the plants, and afterwards through animal organization, formed the first animals,

Digitized by Google

from the minutest zoophyte onward to the largest vertebrate. The same atoms, in a progress of development, formed species out of species of plant and animal, in continual ascension, through all their kinds, from the lowest to the highest. The same atoms, in the course of that development through the higher animals, after reaching the class of apes or monkeys, formed man. The same atoms, while forming and developing plants, imparted life to them, and raised it to successive ascensions of vigour. The same atoms, in forming and developing animals, imparted also the faculty of sensation to them, and raised and widened it in successive ascensions into powers of perception, cognition, imagination, and reason. And the same atoms, at all successive evolutions of higher and higher species of organic things, imbued them with reproductiveness of individuals of their own several kinds. The pristine atoms thus, by cohesions, accumulations, re-arrangements, transmutations, and other processes, became crystals, cells, organs, life, mind, conscience. They became minerals of all kinds, plants of all kinds, animals of all kinds, men of all varieties, mental powers of all sorts. They are the same in all, the substance of all, the energies of all; and they still incessantly run round a circle in all, from the atom of a gas to the concept or thought of an intellect.

Such, comprehensively, is the theory of the men who constructively make Nature to be nothing. If you ask them for explanations of it, they simply give you another theory within it, a third theory within that, a fourth theory within that, and tell you to take these as explanations. You find the theories to resemble a druggist's nest of pill-boxes. You open the first, and find another within it exactly like itself, but smaller; you open that,

Digitized by Google

and find another within it exactly like itself, but smaller; you open that, and find another within it exactly like itself, but smaller; you open the last, and find within it —nothing. You then ask the men to speak plainly; you ask them to say, in direct terms, what they mean by the atoms, the evolving or creative force of them, the entire work of creation; but you get no satisfactory answers—either evasive ones or none at all. The atoms they say, either in themselves or in their processes of evolution, are not creators; they represent Nature. The organic beings also which result from them, or which they constitute, are not creators; they too, in the powers within them, their life, their reproductiveness, their cognitions, their mental forces, represent Nature. The atoms, nevertheless, either originally or in their developed aggregations, were not made, but are expressions or forms of Nature. Whence then, you ask, came the atoms? How did they get their being? Whence arose their forces? What agent made and maintains and works them? Well, say the theorists, the atoms really are a mystery; they elude investigation; they hitherto have baffled every inquirer who has tried to find them out; they are merely supposed to possess an intrinsic force, and to shoot in lines or whirl in vortices or move in some other way unknown to us; they come under cognition only through their results; they exist practically, or are practically cognizable, only as negations giving rise to positives; and they have nothing to do with any agent, nor has any agent anything to do with them; they are simply Nature. But, you ask again, what is Nature as distinguished from the atoms? Well, say the men, Nature is not distinguished from the atoms; does not exist apart from them; is not a force by itself;

Digitized by Google

is not in any sense an agent; is discerned or understood only in identity with the atoms, or with their supposed intrinsic force, and cannot, except in a metaphoric way, be named separately from the atoms otherwise than as their intrinsic, immanent, or inscrutable force. Thus is Nature, in one and the same exposition, first represented as virtually an omnipotent, omniscient, all-wise, creative power, and next construed to be essentially or almost literally nothing.

No wilder theory was ever spun. If the alleged atoms were something, they could not have come from nothing; or if they were nothing, they could not have led to anything. If Nature be not distinct from them, and if Nature be the only creative power, there was no creation. If Nature did not make the atoms, and if Nature be the only creative power, no atoms were made or could exist, and no minerals, plants, or animals, no organization, life, or mind, could accrue from them; or if a real personal Creator did not make creation in some other way, no creation was ever made, no creation exists, no minerals, plants, and animals, no earth beneath or heaven above, are anywhere. The theory is stark mad. It denies God's existence, and cannot help denying also the existence of His creatures. A secluded boy once told us that he long supposed a man's death to consist in his gradually dwindling away to nothing; but this theory tells us a reverse dream, that a man's life, with all his body and all his mind, is simply a development, through immeasurable time, upward from nothing. It tells us, too, that the development began in unrecognizable atoms; proceeded in multitudes of successive forms of mineral and plant; assumed eventually an animal structure; struggled slowly through the forms of

Digitized by Google

zoophytes, molluscs, worms, and insects; worked long through shapes of fishes and reptiles; climbed step by step the ascending scale of mammals; leaped at last into the form of ape; and passed easily thence into the form of man. If monkeys could speak and were to tell you all this, you might laugh at their story as a smart joke for glorifying their kind. But when a man tells it, you cannot but think that he entertains brutal notions about himself, and must have astoundingly different thoughts and feelings from those of most other men. He professes to be the descendant of apes, of reptiles, of spiders, of sea-nettles! A wonder that he professes to exist at all! A greater wonder that, professing to exist, he does not say that he made himself! His theory for evolution from pristine atoms could easily be displaced by as bright a theory for self-creation.

How contrasted are his notions to those of a Christian! A Christian believes that God both created all things and governs all things. He contemplates the Deity as at once creator, preserver, and moral governor. He regards God, not only as having made the earth, but as having adjusted it prospectively to a peculiar moral administration, and as now governing it in a mediatorial reign. He believes that God "made the worlds by His Son, who is the brightness of His glory, the express image of His person, and upholds all things by the word of His power;" that by His dear Son, "who is the image of the invisible God, were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers, all things were created by Him and for Him, and by Him all things consist."[1] A Christian, therefore,

[1] Heb. i. 2, 3; Col. i. 13–17.

Digitized by Google

sees God, not only in the commencement of all things, but also in the progress of all things. He sees Him manifesting clearly "His eternal power and Godhead by the things that are made."[1] He sees the successive evolutions of creation and providence to be successive manifestations of God's working. He sees the entire course of our world's cosmical history, from its origin all onward, not only to include everything which could relate prospectively or presently to life, mind, and other "invisible things," but also to include everything which could relate prospectively or presently to moral government. He sees the earth and its heavens, with all the forces at play in them, from the widest and highest, through all grades, to the narrowest and lowest, "whether they be thrones, dominions, principalities, or powers," to have existed prospectively from the first, as they exist actually now, under the mediatorial reign of Christ. He sees human minds coming into existence, not only as intellects totally different in essence from every kind of cells or atoms, but as souls to be created again in Christ Jesus, and to bear His image.[2] He sees the entire world to have been created and to be governed as a unique system, in all its constituences, physical, organic, mental, and moral, "to the intent that," by the reign of Christ over it, or "by the church, might be made known the manifold wisdom of God to the principalities and powers in heavenly places."[3] And he unites with "the four and twenty elders" in John's vision, the representatives of all classes of redeemed men, from all periods and all climes, in falling down before the Lord God Almighty on His

[1] Rom. i. 20.
[2] 2 Cor. v. 17; Col. iii. 10; Eph. iv. 24; Rom. viii. 29.
[3] Eph. iii. 9, 10.

Digitized by Google

throne, and saying, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power, for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created."[1]

The advocate of universal evolution from pristine atoms, of course, acknowledges none of these truths. He speaks accordantly with his professed descent from mere minerals, and says that everything in him and around him is sheer matter, either crude or polished. He pronounces the most glorious things we can speak of, the most sublimely intellectual, the most gorgeously moral, to be only different phases of the same substances as stones and sand. He regards life, mind, genius, thought, erudition, as only iridescences of matter. He asserts the invisible souls in men to be substantially the same as both the microscopic motes in the air and the visible orbs in the sky; and he places the creative origin, the formative energy, the sustaining power of at once the souls and the orbs, all things of the earth and all things of the heaven, in a mere property of self-constituted atoms, and calls that property Nature. He ascribes to that property operations and results which directly, manifestly, irresistibly imply omnipotence, omniscience infinite wisdom, infinite goodness, the formation of intelligent and accountable creatures, a special providence over all things, and a Divine moral reign over men; yet he sees no life anywhere as life, no mind anywhere as mind, no soul anywhere as soul, no creative intelligence, no providential wisdom, no presiding design over the world, no government of any sort in it, no Divine mediator, no God; he sees only one thing everywhere, a sheer evolution of unaccounted-for, inscrutable, theoretical atoms, somehow or anyhow or nohow identical with

[1] Rev. iv. 10, 11.

Digitized by Google

what he calls Nature; and he treats what he calls Nature, considered apart from the alleged atoms, as an abstraction, a mere name, an absolute nonentity; and speaks as coolly about it as he would about the shadow of a straw. Trace him backward from his conclusions to his premises, and you find his Nature to be nothing, and his atoms to be nothing.

Yet the advocates of the evolution theory, notwithstanding the wildness of their notions, are grave savants, and must be gravely and respectfully treated. They fail utterly, as we have seen, to give any passable explanation of their theory, but they have much to say for it in the way of alleged facts; and they say this with a fulness, a learnedness, and a plausibility which have staggered many a reader. They contend that their inability to explain their theory is really no proof against it; they point to light, to heat, to electricity, to gravitation, as incontestible things which are unknown in themselves, inexplicable in themselves, and known or cognizable only in their properties or effects; and they offer from alleged facts, in support of their theory, a series of pleas, which they claim to be as genuine for belief in universal evolution as any phenomena are for belief in the imponderables. Let us pass on, therefore, to see what these alleged facts are.

One of the alleged facts is that light, heat, and electricity operate in a manner similar to that of the supposed immanent force in atoms. But, first, these things are distinct from universal matter, not inherent in it, not a property of it, not a force belonging to its substance; and therefore differ totally from the hypothetic force of evolution. Next, they are things which come out separately, operate separately, and are subject to control

Digitized by Google

and manipulation and experimentalizing separately; and therefore are again totally different from the hypothetic force of evolution. Next, they are things perceptible, things seen or felt, things making strong impact on the senses; and therefore are once more totally different from the hypothetic force of evolution. Next, they have each a character of its own, an operative power of its own, a range of existence and of action of its own—perfectly distinct both from those of each of the others, and from those of each or any of all other forces; and therefore are again totally different from the hypothetic force of evolution. And, finally, they are thoroughly definite as to all they are and all they do; they have precise limits of character, precisely co-extensive with the limits of their operation; they possess nothing, and are not alleged to possess anything, beyond the range of their demonstrable existence and action; and, therefore, they are once more totally different from the hypothetic force of evolution. In a word, the imponderables are a fact, patent and provable; while the force of evolution has not a single aspect of a fact, but is a sheer theory.

Another alleged fact is that all ponderable matter, chemically considered, whether gas, liquid, or solid, whether in mineral, plant, or animal, is an aggregate of atoms with inherent forces, similar to the evolution theory's pristine atoms with their immanent force. But, first, the chemical atoms are the constituents of a great many different elements, as oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen, chlorine, sulphur, phosphorus, and the numerous metals; and therefore differ totally from the hypothetic atoms of theoretic homogeneous matter. Further, the chemical atoms, constituting any one of

Digitized by Google

the elements, have quantities, weights, and forces peculiar to themselves, or specifically and invariably different from those of the atoms constituting any other of the elements; so that either the atoms of any one element, or of any number of the elements, or of all the elements, differ totally from the theoretic evolution atoms, all of one kind and all with one uniform force. Again, the chemical forces in the elements, operate concurrently or conjointly or upon one another, in element with element, in uniform or invariable ways, producing always and only such combinations or results as they must have produced from the beginning, never passing on from the producing of one kind of effects to the producing of another kind of effects, never doing anything which has the remotest appearance of either change in themselves or evolutional process in their results; so that they differ totally from the hypothetic immanent force of the evolution theory. Again, the effects of chemical action, as apparent in the constitution of all minerals and of all organisms, and throughout the million kinds and million intricacies of reciprocal relations among the world's materials, exhibit deep, broad, brilliant marks of infinitely intelligent design; and therefore differ totally from the effects of any mere mechanical force, such as that of the evolution theory. Again, the chemical forces, while working out kinds, diversities, and even contrarieties of result far beyond the reach of possible computation, yet never anywhere or anyhow produce either life or reproductivity or mind; never, even within living organisms, are otherwise connected with life than to be controlled by it; never have power so much as to resuscitate or restore life within any organized body which has lost it; never become so

Digitized by Google

affiliated with life as to be able to perform or simulate any of its functions; but act always and strongly as forces of altogether another sphere from the sphere of vital forces, insomuch as to behave conversely in any organism when life is absent, from what they do when life is present; so that they differ totally from hypothetic immanent force which the evolution theory sets forth as the originator of living beings. In a word, the atoms and elements and forces of chemistry are facts, clear and demonstrable; while the atoms and the immanent force of the evolutionists have not a single aspect of a fact, but are sheer theory.

Another alleged fact is the existence of "a physical basis of life"—a substance such as the evolution theory postulates in the transition from inorganic matter to organic. What is that? Protoplasm. And what is protoplasm? Really many things with one name, but described by evolutionists as one thing with many characters. What do they say about it? Protoplasm is the unit of all things in all organized beings; it forms and constitutes all tissue, all vitality, all sensiency; it is one and the same substance, whether lifeless or living; it possesses unity of essence, of form, and of power; it does much of its work or exhibits many of its phenomena through contractility; and it is well exemplified in the semi-fluid of a nettle-sting, or in the corpuscles of a drop of blood. Such, according to their own account, is the evolutionists' "physical basis of life." But, first, the basis of anything is not the thing itself; so that even were protoplasm the basis of life, it would not be life itself. Next, a physical basis implies also some other basis, such as reproductional, metaphysical, or volitional; so that even were protoplasm the physical

Digitized by Google

basis of life, it would not be the main or characteristic basis. Next, no substance whatever, as already noted, can chemically or as to chemical action be the same thing in a lifeless state as in a living one; so that protoplasm cannot be what it claims to be, one and the same thing lifeless and living, and therefore is not a transition substance between inorganic matter and organic. Next, any protoplasm exists or works only in result of previous protoplasm; so that every mass of it implies either a Divine creation of any original mass of it, or an eternal self-existence of a series of masses of it; and therefore aggregate protoplasm, on its own showing, explodes the theory both of pristine atoms and of an evolutional force.

Again, protoplasm, as the alleged unit of all things in organized beings, would be not one substance or one essence, but as many different substances as there are constituents and secretions and products in all plants and animals, and as many different essences as there are sentient faculties or sensiencies in the mind of brutes, and as there are rational and moral powers or thoughts and sentiments in the intellect and soul of man; so that it would be, not a transition substance from inorganic bodies to organic ones, but the very multitudinous substance of all organisms past and present, and the very multitudinous essence of all sensations and all cognitions past and present; and therefore would be no more than a comprehensive name for organization as actually existing, not in the least a principle to show how organization began, no better an explanation of the origin of organized beings than to say plants are plants and animals are animals. Again, protoplasm, even in the narrowest definition which any of the theorists give it, as a com-

Digitized by Google

pound of oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and nitrogen, is not one substance but a multitude of substances, such as albumen, fibrin, casein, gluten, legumin, urea, uric acid, glycocol, and many more, all having forces or chemical behaviour widely different from one another; so that it can no more account for the origination of organisms than if it were a manipulation from the contents of a chemist's laboratory. Again, protoplasm, taken in that narrowest definition, excludes many essential constituents, secretions, or products of organic bodies—on the one hand, such as sugar, starch, gum, and oil, which do not contain all its four elements—on the other hand, such as bone, salts, blood, and brain, which contain some other elements than its four; so that either it comes enormously short of exhibiting organisms as they actually exist, or it must be so altered in definition as to become once more tantamount to the truism, plants are plants and animals are animals.

Further, protoplasm, according to the most of the theorists' own account of it, so far from having unity of form, is almost anything or everything as to at once consistence, shape, or structure—either fluid, semi-fluid, gelatinous, or solid, either club-shaped, globe-shaped, cup-shaped, bottle-shaped, spindle-shaped, circle-headed, conical, cylindrical, longitudinal, prismatic, polyhedral, flat, ramose, paralleletic, filiform, or ciliated, and either uniform, granulated, reticulated, or with solid shell and fluid-holding spaces; so that it can be no more than the mere microscopic rendering of organisms, and can no better explain their origin than if it were a dry catalogue of the parts of which they consist—aye, than if it were a mere catalogue of the organisms themselves. Further protoplasm, as described by the theorists, so far from

Digitized by Google

having unity of power, is alleged to exert a diversity of force as multitudinous and vast as the diversity in the organs and the organic functions of all organized beings, in the capacities and sensations of all animals, and in the faculties and thoughts of all men; it is described as possessing the forces which produced diversely the cryptogam and the phanerogam, the endogen and the exogen—diversely the plant inhaling carbonic acid and exhaling oxygen, and the animal inhaling oxygen and exhaling carbonic acid—diversely the organisms which live fixedly in the soil, the organisms which live always under water, and the organisms which live in locomotion through the air—diversely the tissues, specific or interchangeable, of all the myriad kinds of plants and all the myriad kinds of animals—diversely the organisms of the animalcule, the zoophyte, the mollusc, the articulate, and the vertebrate—diversely cilii, shells, bones, ganglions, and brain—diversely all the specifically adapted structures and all the specifically operating functions of prehension, digestion, perception, and sensation—diversely all the many kinds of reproductivity in plants, each of the several kinds of reproductivity in animals, and all the various degrees and conditions of all and each of the reproductivities — diversely the millions of all sorts of reciprocating functions between mineral and plant, between plant and mineral, between plant and plant, between plant and animal, between animal and plant, between animal and animal, between animal and mineral, in quadrillions of courses everywhere round the cycle of sublunary existence—diversely the functions of instinct in the various animals from the lowest to the highest, the functions of sensation and sagacity in the various species from the bee to the dog,

Digitized by Google

and the functions of thought, of will, and of conscience in the various educational conditions of man; and, while set forth as wielding powers so incalculably numerous, so immensely great, so prodigiously diversfied, so completely covering most of the profound mysteries of force which human reason vainly struggles to explore and which only Divine revelation can explain, protoplasm either stands convicted as the most fabulous "unit" which ever a madman dreamt of, or must be accepted as a heart-struck pantheist's idol to represent the omnipotent, omniscient, infinitely wise Deity.

Again, protoplasm, in being represented to do much of its work or to exhibit many of its phenomena through contractility, is shown both to refute the theory respecting itself and to possess no competency to produce the effects ascribed to it; for, in so far as it does some of its work or exhibits some of its phenomena otherwise than by contractility, it has not unity of power, and therefore is not such a substance as the theory claims and requires it to be; and as regards all the most important things which it is alleged to do through contractility, or the things of thought, the manifestations of intellect, the acts of volition, the dictates of the moral sense, it really does none of them and can do none of them. The effort made here by the theorists is to prove its connection with the mind, or rather its identity with mind, or that the working of protoplasm is the working of mind, or that contractions of protoplasmic tissue are thoughts. And what proof do they offer? Simply the allegation that contractile play of muscle constitutes communication between mind and mind. But a communication is neither the thing com-

Digitized by Google

municated nor the agent who produces the thing; a telegraphic wire is neither the telegram running along it, nor the thought expressed by the telegram, nor the mind which produced the thought; so that even were contractile muscle or contractile protoplasmic tissue the communication of thought, it would neither be thought itself nor the seat or source of thought. But contractile muscle, so far from being the communicator of thought, is no more than the mechanism for exhibiting the signs of thought. Two minds are concerned in every communication of thought, one to give, the other to receive; both must previously understand, in a general way, what signs shall express the various multitudinous notions which constitute thought; the communicating mind first originates some particular thought, then effects the particular contractions of muscle which shall exhibit the signs of it; and the receiving mind first does a special act to fix attention on the signs, then effects particular contractions of muscle to read them off. The former's contractions of muscle are all different from the latter's; so that if the contractions were thoughts, the former's thoughts would be totally different from the latter's. And the communication made is not something from muscle to muscle, but something given by mind through muscle and through signs and received by mind through signs and through muscle. Protoplasm, therefore, anywhere or anyhow, with every possible allowance of contractility to it, is neither thought nor faculty of thought nor anything mental.

Further, protoplasm, in order to serve any purpose of the evolution theory, has to show how life began—to bridge the great gulf between lifeless atoms and living organisms—to upheave a connecting continent between

Digitized by Google

the widely separated regions of mere minerals and animated beings. How do the theorists try to make it do that? Simply by the assumption, already demolished, that protoplasm is one and the same thing, lifeless and living. The assumption passes quietly with men who have accustomed themselves to say that matter is mind; but it falls like a thunder-stroke on the ear of common sense. What is it but to say that death and life are the same thing, or that death or life makes no difference to any organized body? The theorists, however, attempt to vindicate it by an alleged analogue. They say that oxygen and hydrogen, under the electric spark, become water; that oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and nitrogen, under the action of pre-existing protoplasm, become the unit or substance of living bodies; and that the change in the former case might as well be pronounced a new thing under the name of aquosity, as the change in the latter case is pronounced a new thing under the name of vitality. But the alleged analogue here is, in reality, a series of contrasts. First, the water case exhibits a new or foreign force, the electric spark, while the protoplasm case exhibits none; for the former shows the constituents of water under the action of electricity, while the latter shows only the constituents of protoplasm in contact with the constituents of protoplasm; or the one shows a thing in subjection to a mighty extrinsic agent, existing apart from it and acting upon it, while the latter shows a thing entirely within itself, untouched by an extrinsic agent, and not acknowledging the existence of any. Next, the water case has definite and invariable constituents, always oxygen and hydrogen, always in the same proportions, so as to be always one and the same thing;

Digitized by Google

while the protoplasm case has utterly indefinite and exceedingly variable constituents, now one of its four elements awanting, now one or two or three other elements present, and at all times countlessly diversfied in the proportions of the elements, so as to be really multitudes of different things, with different constitutions, different properties, different forces, not only always different but often opposite or antagonistic. Next, the water case shows simply water, continuing to be simply water, and powerless to become anything else; while the protoplasm case is alleged to show a substance passing into new substances and new essences, even into all the numberless ingredients of organisms, and into all the subtle things of instinct, sensation, and thought. Next, the water case shows a substance utterly destitute of either reproductivity or formativeness—shows simply water which can neither reproduce itself into more water nor form itself by itself into any other compound; while the protoplasm case is alleged to show a substance reproducing itself to any amount, forming itself by itself into incalculable numbers of substances different from the original one, and even building up complex bodies with immanent power to reproduce both all the varieties of itself singly and all their own structure complexly. Next, the water case is a condition of continued, pure, entire mineralism—the water, whether as vapour, as liquid, as snow, or as ice, continuing to obey only and completely the chemical laws over minerals, just as really as do its constituent oxygen and hydrogen; while the protoplasm case is first a condition of mineralism or lifelessness, and then a condition of living organization or vitality, resisting the chemical laws which formerly governed it, and obeying

Digitized by Google

organico-chemical laws altogether different or opposite. In a word, the water, even with the electric spark, remains lifeless matter; while the protoplasm, without anything, is represented as becoming organic, alive, and intellectual. Is that an analogue? Does that explain how life began or what life is? Better say at once that life is nothing or does not exist!

Finally, protoplasm, in order to serve any purpose of the evolution theory, has to account for its own existence and for the existence of its constituents. Very handy it is for the theorists to sport protoplasm before us as the alleged "physical basis of life," and then to point to it as proof that all existing things were evolved out of atoms! A very convenient exploit it was to exhibit protoplasm, in front phase, as vitality; and an equally convenient exploit it is to exhibit protoplasm, in back phase, as atoms! But whence came protoplasm? Whence arose oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, sulphur, chlorine, calcium, sodium, potassium, iron, and the other elements of protoplasm? Nay, we might say, whence arose the atoms? But as the atoms are the theory and protoplasm is the alleged fact, we ask only whence came the protoplasm or its elements? Whence? whence? The theorists say not; they are silent as the dead. Only an echo from their place answers, Whence? But one of them, startled by the question, bethinks him of giving it another direction, twists it round again to the origin of organic beings, strikes out an altered theory about the power of the sun's light, and says—"Who or what bestowed upon the ultimate particles of matter the forces whose interaction, combined with the energy of the solar rays, produces plants and animals—science does not know; the mys-

Digitized by Google

tery, though pushed back, remains as deep as ever." How much more will he say so respecting the origin of protoplasm or the elements of protoplasm! If he overtly says nothing and can say nothing as to the state of things at the far-forward stage when plants and animals began to be, how certainly will he say nothing and be unable to say anything as to the state of things at the far-backward stage when chemical compounds and mineral crystallizations began to be! Theory all, theory blank as a vacuum and dark as the grave, with not one atom of fact in view! "Science does not know!" Yes, *his* science, pseudo-science, evolution-theory science, does not know. Anything which calls itself science, but rejects the teaching of facts and of revelation, does not know. The famed old sages of Greece and Rome, so much admired by many savants now, did not know. Why? "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath showed it unto them; for the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse; because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened; professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the truth of God into a lie." [1] Yes, empty imaginations and a darkened heart have all they who shut their eyes to the Creator's manifestations of Himself in His own creation. Thales, with his moisture theory of the origin of things, Anaximenes, with his air theory, Diogenes, with his soul-of-air theory,

[1] Rom. i. 19–25.

Digitized by Google

and other ancients with their atoms theory, exactly like our modern sceptics with their evolution theory, have "walked in darkness and seen no light." They have travelled in their speculations into nothing but "mystery;" and the farther and farther they have gone, they have found "the mystery as deep as ever." "They have passed through unknown shadows on which ancient centuries were impressed; and a dial-plate was there, whereon no number appeared; but a dark finger pointed thereon, and the dead sought to see by it." Yes, yes, darkness all! "Their science does not know; and the mystery, though pushed back, remains as deep as ever!" But let them simply believe in God, as He has manifested Himself in His works and revealed Himself in His word, and they will be "called out of darkness into His marvellous light."[1] "God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all;"[2] and He "hath shined in the hearts" of all who truly believe in Him, "to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."[3] There is "the mystery" made known.[4] There may "all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ."[5] "In whom we have redemption through His blood, *even* the forgiveness of sins . . . . for by Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things were created by Him and for Him; and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist."[6]

Another alleged fact, in defence of the evolution

[1] 1 Peter ii. 9. [2] 1 John i. 5. [3] 2 Cor. iv. 6.
[4] Eph. iii. 3. [5] Eph. iii. 9. [6] Col. i. 14–17.

Digitized by Google

theory, is that all organic beings, whether plants or animals, are aggregates of primary cells. But this is the same alleged fact as that of protoplasm, with only a slight difference in the phases of it, or in the way of representing it. The two alleged facts are so essentially one and the same, that many evolutionists employ the terms primary cells and protoplasm as interchangeable. We, therefore, have already said all that needs to be said for refutation; and we shall merely add a brief summary, in forms of expression suited to the slightly different phases of the alleged fact. No cells, either entire or rudimentary, are in any minerals; no cells are formed except out of organic tissue; no cells of any plants are the same chemically as the cells of any animals; no cells of any one species of plants or of any one species of animals are the same reproductively as the cells of any other species; and no dead cells are the same as living ones, or have the power to generate living ones. All living cells possess life, as a principle entirely foreign to their chemical constitution, and entirely controlling it; all possess reproductivity, as a principle peculiar to living organized beings, and as vigorous in the lowest as in the highest; all in animals are associated with instinct, sensation, and sagacity, as principles entirely foreign to minerals and plants, and endlessly diversified in reciprocity with the specific organization of each of the multitudes of species; and all in man exist and work in connection with reason and conscience, or with intuitions, sequential cognitions, moral volitions, and religious aspirations, as things which do not exist in any other animals, and which obey laws and work out results entirely unknown in any department of the organic world except the human.

Digitized by Google

And while the cells themselves, as to everything in them or about them which can compare with mineral substances, possess or exhibit only chemical forces, these other principles with which living cells are associated—life, reproductivity, instinct, sensation, sagacity, thought, reason, and the moral sense—possess and exhibit forces both entirely different from chemical ones and exceedingly grander. The alleged fact, then, that organic beings are an aggregate of primary cells, is scarcely so much as the semblance of a fact; is very far from being even a half-truth; is no more than a thin veil of truth thrown over a thick mass of falsehood; is merely recognition of the chemico-physical portion of the organic world, accompanied by repudiation of its life, its reproductivity, its instincts, its mind, and all its connections with moral government and with Deity. Nor is it even so much as that; for it tries to throw its glimmer of light upon the cosmos only forward from a standpoint at or after the origin of organic beings—has its back toward all the anterior state of things—and pronounces all to be darkness there, nothing to be known there, everything to be "mystery" there! But "known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world."[1] And "God that made the world and all things therein, and giveth to all life and breath and all things, hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us, for in Him we live and move and have our being."[2]

[1] Acts xv. 18. [2] Acts xvii. 24-28.

Digitized by Google

A striking outcome of the evolution theory is its dead, rank, sheer materialism. Some of its advocates deny this, and make some attempts at metaphysics. But their metaphysics are physical; their philosophy is protoplasmic; their sensational things are cellular; all their mental things are material. The furthest entities they reach are light, heat, electricity, chemical affinity, molecular energy, gravitation, motion, and sound; and all these are either matter or incidents in matter. The evolutionist, struggle and wriggle how he may, is inhumed in matter. His theory makes himself a mere mass of matter, exactly the same as any other mass of matter. He pronounces himself and all other animals, and all plants, to be sheer protoplasm; pronounces himself and all other mundane things, gases, liquids, solids, mud, and dirt, to be all agglomerations of pristine atoms. He regards his own mind, his own life, the life of all living things, as only a finer form of the same thing as the salt which he swallows or the mire which befouls his boots. He proclaims the grandest things of reason, the most sublimely intellectual, the most gorgeously moral, to be only different phases of the same substances as stones or garbage. He regards life, mind, thought, genius, erudition, exactly as he regards the play of colours on a shell, as no more than iridescences of matter. He asserts the immortal souls of men to be essentially the same as the transient motes in the air, both alike the spurt or the passing foam of a stream of ancient atoms. How shall we designate this theory? Somebody called it "the dirt philosophy." What else is it?"

Another striking outcome of the evolution theory is its mechanicalism. This is not attempted to be denied or modified. The evolutionist roundly accepts it. His

Digitized by Google

pristine atoms and his immanent force are avowedly the materials and the working of a great mechanism. He first assumes the existence of the atoms, though he has not the slightest notion as to whence, why, how, or what they were; he next pronounces them the substance of all minerals that were ever to be, the pre-protoplasm of all organisms that were ever to be, the essence of all life, all mind, all thought that were ever to be, though he takes entirely for granted everything about them as such which he is pleased to place in his hypothesis; he next ascribes to them an intrinsic formative power, or a power of evolving themselves into all sorts of creatures, though he knows no more about that, as to whence, how, why, or what it is, than he knows about the atoms themselves; he next represents them, or the power which he ascribes to them, as working out all the many million kinds of minerals, plants, and animals solely in the way of making machines, but gives no account and takes no cognizance of the origin of either chemical, vital, or mental forces otherwise than as part of the machine-making process; and he throughout describes the process, from the state of pristine atoms to the state of things now, as all manifestative of what all other men call infinite power, prescience, intelligence, wisdom, and beneficence, yet ends as he began by declaring it all mechanical. *O mirabile!* Why did not the atoms make all actual machines too? Much more easy would it have been for them to make all the lifeless machines that should ever be handled than to make all the living machines that should ever handle them, and all the myriad times more other living machines that should never need them. The most exquisite mechanism of the most ingenious machine which ever man made is

Digitized by Google

unutterably rude as compared with the mechanism of even low organizations; and the magnificently wonderful mechanism of the highest organization, as existing in man, is incomparably less wonderful than the union with it, and the reciprocities over it, of rational intellect and immortal soul. Delusion would it be, wide as a gulf, to believe that evolutional atoms could make art-machines; but delusion it is, wide as an ocean, to believe that they made organic mechanisms; and delusion, wide as worlds, to believe that they made mind and soul!

Another striking outcome of the evolution theory is its virtual admission of everything which it formally denies. The theorists describe what they call the evolution force or the evolution process in most transcendent terms. They describe it in a manner immensely above all possible notion of even the highest material energy, the highest mechanical power, the highest finite intelligence, the highest conceivable combination or concentration of all three. They ascribe to it operations and results which directly, manifestly, irresistibly, imply omnipotence, omniscience, infinite wisdom, infinite goodness, the formation of intelligent creatures, a special providence over all things, and a Divine moral reign over man. They so exhibit their very pristine atoms as to leave no possible way of accounting for their existence except by the creative will and fiat of an infinite Spirit; and they so exhibit the alleged immanent force in them as to make it, in all respects, tantamount to that infinite Spirit's predestination or prevision of all the results which are evolved. Whatever difference may be found between their description of the cosmos and a Christian's description, is essentially a difference only in

Digitized by Google

the way of viewing it. They virtually describe the cosmos as the work of omnipotence, omnipresence, infinite wisdom, and infinite goodness, as to at once matter, mind, and moral things, once for all; while a Christian describes it as exactly the same work continuous or progressive. Or they virtually describe it as a Divine work, streaming all onward, by purpose or predestination, from one primordial Divine act; while a Christian describes it as a Divine work everywhere and always carried on, in all acts, as in the first act, by the Divine will according to the Divine purpose. They, accordingly, indulge very often in delineations and details which, taken apart from their theory, a devout Christian can heartily adopt. Their descriptions abound in substantially true and grand echoings of the voice of the Creator. Many passages in their writings read almost like responses to the Psalmist's exclamation, "O Lord, how manifold are Thy works! in wisdom hast Thou made them all."[1] Their innate beliefs are too strong for their acquired scepticisms. Their intuitions of God's existence, of His omnipresence, of His omniscience, of His almighty will and working, of His government over all things, of their being face to face with Him in His works, of their accountability to Him, and of a great hereafter when they must stand before His bar—these intuitions have not been killed by their speculations, but only benumbed, be-opiated, put into temporary oblivion by mental chloroform, and continue as surely alive in them still as they did in the old Greek polytheists, or as they do in modern worshippers of fetish. Their utterances at times when the chloroform goes off, their clear theistic conceptions at times when

[1] Psa. civ. 24.

Digitized by Google

the effulgence of God's works comes strong upon them, are evidences that their evolution theory virtually admits everything which it formally denies; "which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness." [1]

2. We come now to look at the development theory. This has reference to organic beings; and it always, in the hands of all its partizans, represents plants as the ancestors of animals, the lower animals as the ancestors of monkeys, and monkeys as the ancestors of men; yet it has much diversity of character, or is really a number of different theories under one name. The evolutionists hold it as a part of their evolution theory, and therefore ascribe the rise and progress of the organic world to the working of pristine atoms; but parties who acknowledge the existence of God also hold it, and ascribe the use and progress of the organic world, in some respect or other, to His Divine agency. These men, indeed, assign circumscribed limits to that agency; speak very sparsely about God; sometimes write entire chapters, or entire books, without a word of reference to Him; and currently talk about Nature, and about "natural laws" in terms as if Nature or "natural laws" were something apart from God and independent of God. How far, as a class, they ascribe creational work to the Deity, and how far to some independent thing which they call Nature or "natural law," it would be difficult to say. They differ much among themselves on various points, and most of all, perhaps, as to the limits or degrees which they assign to direct Divine agency or design, or as to the sense in which they use the terms "Nature" and "natural law." Yet even the

[1] Rom. ii. 15.

Digitized by Google

least theistic of them acknowledge God as the original or primary creator ; and all attempt to account for things by workings of Nature, only in regard to plants and animals. Darwin himself, the foremost advocate of the development theory, whose great advocacy of it has occasioned it to be often designated the Darwinian theory, traces what is called a natural development no further back than from the origin of organic beings, and is far from ascribing that origin to any energy in previous mineral substances. He says, "the first origin of life on this earth, as well as the continued life of each individual, is at present beyond the scope of science." He further says, "I should infer that probably all the organic beings which have ever lived on the earth have descended from some one primordial form, into which life was first breathed by the Creator." He talks also of the remote time when "the first creature, the progenitor of innumerable extinct and living descendants, was created." The gist of all he says, nevertheless, is to assign as little as possible to Divine agency ; to assign to it no more than the creation of "some one primordial form," with impartation of life to it—the creation of only a first living creature, a progenitor of all other living things ; and to assign all the origination and construction of all the other species of plants and animals that ever existed, or that exist now, to the working of Nature or of what he calls natural selection. The ruling thought with some of his followers, too, in adopting his theory rather than the evolution one, may reasonably be presumed to be their either seeing or dreading the crushing mass of argument which comes against the evolution theory.

The development theory, again, is understood and pleaded by some persons in a sense which scarcely goes

Digitized by Google

further than to deny special Divine providence. These persons appear, at times, to speak of development as if it were only a mode of God's working, or to speak of it at least as if God designed it all, ordained it all, provided for it all. They talk almost as currently as the others do of Nature, or of natural law; but they do not consider that as "an immanent force," or as a power which got existence apart from God. They do enormous mischief by their manner of speaking; but they do not mean to do it at all. They shake, or try to shake, their readers' belief in God's personal providence; and they mean to do that. They also call off their readers' thoughts from God's glory in His physical creation; but they do not mean to do that. They further keep entirely out of view the glory of God in His moral government, or in the connexions of it with His physical creation; but they either do not see any of that themselves, or imagine it to be all a topic beyond their sphere. Some of them even are so far theists as to say that they see no difference, as to philosophical principle, between the doctrine of separate and successive creations of all separate and successive species, and the doctrine of a designed, inevitable, physical development of species from the lowest and earliest onward to the highest and latest. These men attach the same theological value to the one doctrine as to the other. They may be found to contend for special creations at one period of their life, to contend for development at another period, and yet to make no change in their religious beliefs. They treat the origin of species as a question of organisms only, or of organisms mainly; they leave out of view, or do not take sufficiently into view, the concurrent questions of physiology, metaphysics, and moral forces; they

Digitized by Google

assume as a true rule, what in some important respects is a false one, that an investigator ought to summarize all forces which he observes to be at work, and to trace up divergent and successive ones to as few primary forces as possible; they regard the forces in a development view as simply outspread continuations of one force, or of one set of forces, in a primal Divine creation view; and they therefore esteem it, in a theological or religious light, a matter of indifference whether they say that the Creator had acted once for all, or had acted millions of times in originating species—had done only one previsive creation of organic beings, or had done innumerable successive creations.

The development theory, then, presents numerous and widely different aspects. It is held by atheists, by pantheists, by deists, by quasi-theists. It has shapes which ascribe creative agency constructively to nothing, and shapes which ascribe that agency, with much diversity of limitation, to the Divine Being. It ranges from a denial of God's working altogether, or from a denial of His existence, to a denial of only His working in His special providence, and an ignoring of His moral government. It exhibits, in even its mildest form, a repulsive aspect; and it loses much of any redeeming influence which it might have in the hands of its quasi-theistic advocates, by their speaking currently of the forces in it, almost as much as the materialists do, as forces of Nature, or as natural laws. It affords just another illustration, and a strong one, of what a juggle the word "Nature" is; for, while it sets forth development as a great process of Nature, and always designates that as strictly one process, it now makes Nature to be constructably nothing, now makes it to be God once only at a

Digitized by Google

certain epoch, and now makes it to be God in some sense continually through all ages. One great argument for it rests on misconstruction or misapprehension of the forces called "natural laws;" and, being used also against the doctrines of special creation, providence, miracles, and revelation, will be postponed for consideration to our chapter on the Supernatural. The other arguments for it, apart from some which we have already noticed as advanced by evolutionists, have been stated, pleaded, and illustrated with a skill, a learnedness, an eloquence, and a copiousness, which, though utterly powerless even to convince, are well fitted often to astonish and sometimes to bewilder. They also have been exhibited in such exceeding detail, through such a multitude of minutiæ, with such a display of scientific technicality, that a hundred-fold more of space than we can command would scarcely be sufficient for noticing them all in the way in which they have been put. But they readily admit of being stated with full significance, in only three summary facts or alleged facts; and they still more readily explode into nothingness at a single touch or two of argument. An unpractised observer seeing them in the distance, may momentarily consider them at once real, multiform, and pretty, like a landscape, with water, islets, and wood; but on his getting nearer to them, he finds them sheer mirage, absolute illusion.

One of the three summary facts, alleged in defence of the development theory, is that all organic beings exhibit oneness of plan. But, first, any plan of any kind implies a purpose, a will, a designing intelligence; and a plan so vast as that of the organic world can imply no less a purpose or will than the purpose and will of an infinite,

Digitized by Google

omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, all-wise, all-beneficent Creator. Oneness, no doubt, pervades the plan; but it is an intellectual and not a material oneness. It exists in the Mind that made the world, and made all organic beings. And it simply proves that "God is one," [1] and that "He is in one mind and none can turn Him." [2] Again, the oneness of the plan is, in no degree, of such a kind as to indicate either intrinsic re-direction of forces at any time or extrinsic outgrowth of new species; in no degree, of such a kind as to be seen only or mainly in uniformity of any amount, still less of all amount, of organic structure; in no degree, of such a kind as to constitute the chief characteristic of the organic world, or to be interpretable or comprehensible apart from other characteristics which look all the opposite way to that of oneness; but, in every degree, of such a kind as, taken along with the other characteristics, to manifest at once God's unity of being, His infinitude of perfection, and His omnipresent power and wisdom through all His works and through all time. Again, the oneness of the plan exists everywhere and always in conjunction with infinite diversity. The plan is nowhere seen in oneness apart from diversity, either in the reciprocal actions throughout the organic world, or in the inter-connections among the ranges of species, or in the relation of function to function among different kinds, or even in the mere structure of the nearest congeners. It exhibits the oneness with the diversity in a universal, minute, perfect, constant, reciprocal adaptation of all creatures to each and of each to all; it embraces countless ranges of direction, and countless varieties of detail in each of the countless

[1] Gal. iii. 20; Deut. vi. 4. [2] Job xxiii. 13.

Digitized by Google

ranges; it displays as strikingly multiplicity within the circle as unity around it—as grandly diversity in the details of each contained range as uniformity in that range's general outline; it sets forth the structures, functions, and forces, and inter-connectional impacts of organic beings as stamped with the character, even more than with any other, that they are "manifold works." It therefore proves directly, and proves only, the boundless power, knowledge, and wisdom of the Creator. Finally, the entire plan does not relate to any one force or set of forces in the organic world, like the immanent force of the evolutionists, or the natural selection of the Darwinians, or the natural law or physical laws of the other developmentists; but it relates to all the forces which operate either on organic beings or within them, the dynamic, the atmospheric, the molecular, the chemical, the vegetable-vital, the animal-vital, the reproductive, the instinctive, the sensative, the volitional, the rational, and the moral. Nor does it relate to them as if they ran in one groove or worked in one sphere; but it relates to them as operating severally, all in their own several ways, each with its own distinct results. The fact of oneness in the plan, therefore, affords not a hairs-breadth of footing for the development theory; presents not a line of analogy to it; but opposes it in every respect, and demolishes it throughout.

Another summary fact, or alleged fact, adduced in defence of the development theory, is that a gradation of species exists in organic beings, in regular order from the lowest to the highest. Now, first, gradation, considered simply as gradation, implies merely advancement, progress, ascension; or does not imply origination,

Digitized by Google

formative energy, genetic force, or anything else essential to the development theory. A gradation of houses could be built in regular ascension, all in a row, from the rudest hut through all grades to the grandest palace; but that would not suggest that each one had produced its neighbour, or that the palace grew remotely from the hut. Or if any kindred suggestion arose, it would solely be the suggestion that extrinsic mind planned and built the whole. Further, gradation of a certain kind, commencing in small and simple forms, and proceeding onward to great and complete ones, undoubtedly exists in the organic world; but it is gradation only or gradation truly; it is advancement, progress, ascension merely; it never shows, and does not imply, origination, formative energy, genetic force, or outgrowth in any way of one species from another, still less of all the higher species from lower ones; it has never been known to show any such thing, or to show any phenomenon which developmentists themselves could construe into such a symptom, excepting only a few variations which have really another character altogether, and will afterwards be considered. The analogue of it is found in the growth of each individual plant, in the expansion of man's intellect, in the progress of human knowledge, in the successive revelation of the Divine will, and in the advancing administrations of the Divine plan of mercy. True gradation is seen in each of these as distinctly as in the organic world; and as seen in that, no less than as seen in them, it has not one aspect of sameness with the theoretic development, or of resemblance to it, but presents an entire and most striking contrast.

Further, true gradation itself is not continuous; and

Digitized by Google

therefore, even were it similar to the gradation imagined by the developmentists, would not support their theory. A great gap is in it at the transition from plants to animals; a gap, indeed, which the theorists labour strenuously to conceal by discussion on the mere organisms of the highest plants and the lowest animals; but a gap at once manifest, broad, and deep, as seen in the light of either chemistry or function. Great gaps are in the fossil species at the ends of respectively the Permian and the Cretaceous periods, besides many lesser gaps at other periods; and are so obvious that no attempt is made to hide them, except by circuitous and illusive argument. Gaps occur also at numerous intervals all up the ascent of extant vegetable species, and all up the ascent of extant animal species. One very great gap, likewise, as to structure, is at the transition from the invertebrate animals to the vertebrates; and another, as to faculties and function, is at the transition most crucial to the development theory—the transition from monkey to man. And all these gaps defy ingenuity to bridge them, and serve as sure evidence that successive species were successive creations. Further, the theoretic gradation of the developmentists is disproved by the facts of embryology. For example, more than one hundred species of bird embryos, examined by Agassiz, were found, at a certain age, to have all bills, wings, legs, feet, and some other organs exactly alike; the robin and the crow, for instance, to be web-footed as well as the duck, and not to get their own distinctive characters of foot till a later age. Here was no development, but the opposite. Here was no speciality of organs derived, as the development theory alleges, from the working of natural selection or of natural law onward

Digitized by Google

or outward from one species into another; but here, on the contrary, was fixity or sameness of organs, even many and distinctive organs, in birth and embryon growth of more than an hundred species, all contemporaneous, and each for long ages complete. Nor was the after-acquisition of distinctiveness in any case development of species from species, but in every sense transformation of each species within itself.

Further, the theoretic gradation of developmentists is disproved by the facts of alternate generation. For example, a circle of existence is run by hydroids dividing themselves into buds or sections, by these buds or sections growing into jelly-fishes, by these jelly-fishes laying eggs, and the eggs producing hydroids. Were this circle to break asunder, and to form straight lines, so as to make the jelly-fishes permanently separate, with eggs producing jelly-fishes, it would be a wonderful find for the developmentists—would at last be a real thing for them to work with—would at length give them, what they so sorely need—a fact. But it goes always regularly round; and while ever exhibiting alternately two living creatures about as different seemingly from each other as any two species can well be, and with methods of reproduction as really different as those of two actual species very far apart, it teaches a doctrine utterly fatal to the development theory, that however much a species may disport itself in forms, even to the apparent annihilation of itself and to the apparent engendering of a totally different species, it nevertheless remains invariable. Finally, the theoretic gradation of developmentists is disproved by the facts of transformation. These are well exemplified in the butterfly class of insects and the frog family of reptiles; but they

Digitized by Google

occur in all orders, radiate, mollusc, articulate, and vertebrate, and are not a little remarkable even in the human being. If any one of the most striking lines of transformation, as from the larva to the butterfly, or from the tadpole to the frog, could be seen extending along a series of species from lower to higher, that again would be a rich find for the developmentist, and would furnish him with a fact. The fact, too, as a fact of gradation, would greatly transcend everything which he fancies or sets forth in his hypothetic gradation. The successive phases of organization in the progress of one transformation in one individual are both more numerous and more complex than those in a comparatively long ascent of species; or they show the same individual in greater organic difference from himself at an early stage and at a late one, than is the organic difference between a comparatively low species and a comparatively high one; and yet, as seen anywhere or everywhere throughout the entire organic world, they exhibit always and absolutely fixity of species. An oak remains invariably an oak; a frog remains invariably a frog; each plant or each animal remains invariably what it is and was. A few monstrosities, indeed, occasionally appear; and these, these only, under euphonious names, though never forming new kinds, are seized and handled by the theorists in vindication of their theory; but the monstrosities alone as proofs can do no more than prove the theory to be monstrous.

The third alleged summary fact, in defence of the development theory, is that many a species passes into the next above it by such nice degrees as to render distinction between them impossible, and that some species sport and diversify into such numerous and wide

Digitized by Google

varieties as to be really, all and severally, disrupted species in stages or lines of development toward the formation of others. But, first, two kindred species, though so nearly alike as to be undistinguishable from each other by any given observer, may nevertheless be perfectly distinct. Some minerals are known to have the same form with differences of elements, or the same elements with differences of proportions, and therefore to be as distinct from one another as any other minerals; and so also may two plants or two animals, with seemingly the same organization or the same functions, have specifically different constitutions. Ignorance alone, such as has not been uncommon even among learned men, may be the cause of the inability to distinguish them; and that will scarcely be vaunted as a plea for the development theory. Again, two reputedly kindred species, whether of plants or of animals, may really be one and the same species, under differences of condition; the plants as to soil and climate, the animals as to season and sustenance and health. Instances of such are well known; insomuch that here and there what figures in present scientific systems as one plant or one animal, figured in former systems as two. Ignorance alone is at work in all such cases; and that, once more, will scarcely be accepted as a plea for the development theory. Again, the species which sport into varieties are not more than a single one to ten thousand, compared with the species which any intelligent developmentist must admit to have been almost constant. All that are discussed by the theorists do not amount to more than as a stray bush or two compared with a forest; yet are discussed with a zeal and a copiousness which give assurance that these are all which can be

Digitized by Google

found. What is the proper inference? Is it that, as is the one, so are the ten thousand? Is it not rather that, as are the ten thousand, so is the one? The one, at best, is abnormal; and the existence of it, at the utmost, is a reason for trying to discover why it is abnormal. But the theorists first pronounce it as normal; next determine, from their own theory, what character makes it normal; and next transfer that theoretic normal character to the ten thousand! Such is their logic; and it is in keeping with their philosophy.

Again, all the variating species are constitutionally as steady and persistent as the other species. They variate never in their fully proper or native condition; they variate only under disturbing influences; and wherever or however they may variate, they always manifest a keen and unconquerable tendency to resume purely and entirely their original character. Their variation-forms, or varieties, are either monstrosities, malformations, or simple exaggerations; they neither possess nor can imbibe any tendency to depart further from the parent type than to certain limits, all within the specific typal outline; and they either will not propagate at all, or will propagate only with progressive diminution of their variation peculiarities, and with progressive resumption of the unvariationed original type. These facts are well known to every experienced field-cultivator, every experienced gardener or florist, every experienced breeder of live stock; nor merely well known, but they mould and regulate the whole of the intricate arts of cultivation Hence is the occurrence of variations, in the judgment of such highly competent judges as Agassiz, "only an additional evidence of the fixity of species." Again, nearly all the variating species have been disturbed or

Digitized by Google

worked into their variation-forms by the controlling intelligence of man. They are either cultivated plants or domesticated animals. They are found only within the range of the human epoch—never among ante-human fossils; they are admitted by the developmentists themselves to have been removed, within the human epoch, from unvariating parents in native habitats; they were manipulated by man's arts, under a purpose, toward an end; and they manifestly underwent variation, under control of man's will and handling, solely in result of the Creator's beneficent arrangement that, as a stimulus to human industry and as a reward of it, sterile soils shall become fertile under skilful husbandry, economical plants shall acquire increase of alimentary or medicinal substance under skilful cultivation, and domesticable animals shall rise into higher serviceableness under skilfully collocated circumstances of breeding. What affects them throughout, or alone has to do with their variation-forms, is the control of human intelligence. But that is neither "immanent force," nor "natural selection," nor any sort of intrinsic "natural laws;" but a force or a stream of force entirely outside the subjects, entirely different from anything inside of them, and entirely belonging to the exalted and peculiar sphere of reason and moral volition. And yet even this does not and cannot divert any one variation-form from its persistent tendency to return to its original type. Wheat and dogs are the forms which the developmentists discuss far more largely and loudly than any other as favouring their theory. But not all the generations of men in succession, notwithstanding their combination in the play of intelligence, and notwithstanding their accumulations of knowledge from age to age, have been

Digitized by Google

able to make wheat to be anything else than wheat or a dog to be anything else than a dog.

Again, the ascension of species by however slight degrees, or the transition from each one to the next howsoever slightly marked, indicates neither more nor less nor otherwise than repetition of the same causative agency which gave existence to the first. The ascension is not fusion; the transition is not continuity; the progress onward and upward is simply repetition. Nor is it less distinctly repetition only, but more distinctly so, that each successive instance of it exhibits increased breadth of character. A thousand ceramic vessels might be produced in a first-class pottery, ranging regularly from the rudest brown-ware bowl to the most exquisite porcelain vase, and all passing upward by such nice degrees as to render distinction between any two of them impossible by an unpractised observer; and yet each one of them as distinctly as the first, but the final one more distinctly than any, would be separately and entirely the work of the potter. The vessels, though all of similar material, all exhibiting a certain unity, and all produced in one factory, are severally and individually the product of the same agency which originated each and all. Even the evolutionist says so; is compelled by pressure of logic to say so; and therefore, while denying the agency to be Divine, asserts it to be material. But the other developmentists believe the aboriginal agency to have been Divine; they say that the first species was created by God; or they say, what is stronger still, that the primordial type or types of the entire organic world were created by God; and, if they would retain a shred of logic, they must admit that the work all onward was God's. One agency, and only one, is seen at the

Digitized by Google

commencement; that one agency is there as a stupendous fact; and that surmounts and overrules everything onward. No amount of speculation, by theory, can throw the shadow of a doubt on the permanence of that Divine agency; far less can any amount of speculation so impugn it as to foist a mere physical agency into its place. Nothing could confirm it short of proof from fact that the Divine agency has ceased to be. Will any developmentist be daring enough to attempt to prove that?

Again, the ascension of species by however slight degrees, or the transition from each one to the next howsoever slightly marked, is due to causation. Every successive species, as truly as the first, was produced by a cause. But the hypothetic force assigned by any school of the developmentists as the producer of all species after the first, is not a cause. Natural selection, for example, which is set forth by the largest and most showy school of them as the producing force—is a mere negation, or at best a negative of conditions. It is represented not even as a force, not as operating, not as modifying, not as doing anything, but simply as a negative state of things, in virtue of which the fittest or strongest or least deprivationed individual of a species survives the other individuals, and becomes the parent of a new species. It is not the presence or power of any new thing in the individual who survives, but the absence or the extinction of things in the individuals who perish. It relates entirely to conditions; and it does not even make conditions to be in any way positive, but makes them to be in every way negative. Its partizans do not say that conditions ever originated life; nor do they say that an increase of conditions ever originated a new species; but they say merely that life

Digitized by Google

is dependent on conditions, insomuch that a decrease of conditions may destroy an old species. What pretence of cause or causation can be here? Look at it as illustrated by an example. A species of herbivora are overtaken by a scarcity of herbage; some individuals of them strain up their necks to get leaves from trees, and therefore continue to live, while the others do not or cannot strain up their necks to get leaves, and therefore perish; and the survivors form a new species, distinguished from the old ones by comparatively longer necks. Such is an instance of development by natural selection. The alleged force in it, the alleged formative power in it, the alleged thing in it giving origin to a new species, is decrease of herbage or negation of food. Similar things are great decrease of temperature, destroying inter-tropical animals; great decrease of sea-depth, destroying large marine animals; and great decrease of forest and of waste lands, destroying wild animals. All such things are negations. Yet they constitute the alleged formative force of the development theory. That force, therefore, is nothing, and ever was nothing; so that it never did and never could produce anything.

Again, the ascension of species, or the transition onward and upward from species to species, requires, according to the principles or the working of the development theory to have been always progressive from lower to higher, and always extinctive of the lower along with origination of the higher. The analogue of it is transformation in an individual, as in any species of butterfly; progress from ovule to caterpillar, from caterpillar to chrysalis, from chrysalis to the perfect insect, and disappearance of the ovule at the appearance of the caterpillar, disappearance of the caterpillar at the appearance of the

Digitized by Google

chrysalis, disappearance of the chrysalis at the appearance of the perfect insect. But what do we find in the record of the rocks? First, as we formerly noted, there are great gaps, where no ascension of any sort, no gradation, no continuity exists. Next, among the oldest fossils are some very simple organisms, seemingly contemporaneous with the low end of the ascension series, but closely similar to very simple organisms now existing contemporaneously with the extreme high end of that series. Next, among the same oldest fossils, down so low as the lowest Silurian, are typal forms, such as lingula, which continue to live till the present day. Next, among the same oldest fossils are species, such as trilobites and orthoceratites, which, as compared with the very simple kinds, present high organization. Next, in almost every successive age of rocks, new types appear in full organization, without a trace, either before them or around them or in them, of any evolvement out of previous types. Next, many a new type or new species, so far from coming into view sparsely and slowly, as the development theory requires it to have done, comes into view teemingly and at once, insomuch as to exist by myriads in the first bed in which it is found. Next, many a disappearing species, instead of disappearing gradually, as the development theory requires it to have done, disappears at once or suddenly, and transmits not a vestige of itself to the succeeding bed. All these facts, and several others of kindred import, explode the alleged development process into nothingness, and pour derision on the strongest pleadings of its partizans.

Again, the ascension of species, according to the development theory, requires to have been a continuous and regular run of improvement from a primordial type

Digitized by Google

onward through all organic structure. But was it so? First, one type throughout plants and animals has never been imagined in any closer form than to figure a pea-pod as resembling a mollusc, and a rose-fruit or hip as resembling a vertebrated animal; and cannot be conjured into fancy from stage to stage of the organic world by even the wildest day-dreamer. Next, four different types of the animal world alone, all distinct from one another, and no lower one passing into a higher, the peripheric type in radiates, the longitudinal type in articulata, the massive type in molluscs, and the doubly symmetrical type in vertebrates, were clearly demonstrated by Cuvier, and have been fully accepted by all eminent zoologists. Next, some of the most elaborate organisms, which the development theory requires to have been possible only at a very advanced stage of the ascension in species, are as complete and wonderful in some of the low or early animals as in the highest or latest; for example, the organisms of vision in trilobites were as complete and wonderful as are the organisms of vision in man himself. Next, some succeeding species of animals in the early periods were of lower type than preceding ones; some entire succeeding genera or entire succeeding classes wanted important organisms, or organs of important usefulness, which were possessed by preceding ones; and all the multitudes of early species whatever, even up to the first vertebrates, had important structural adaptations to modes of life, which were not transmitted to the later and higher ones. Next, the very vertebrates themselves, which alone can be plausibly pleaded as built upon one type, cannot, without great twist and torsion of argument, be held forth as a gradually ascending series. They are all and each, of course,

Digitized by Google

vertebral—all and each most beautiful—all and each most exquisitely manifestative of the wisdom and beneficence of the Creator; but they possess endless diversity, most multiform diversity, exceedingly wide diversity; sometimes almost contrasted diversity of organisms—even of pre-eminent organisms, as those of locomotion, of prehension, of mastication, of digestion, and of perception; and they possess that diversity mainly in concentric circles or in parallel lines, and so very little so inversely in ascending order that some eminent zoologists, who attempt to classify them in the manner of ascending order, arrange them as fishes, reptiles, mammals, and birds. To trace all fishes or any fish ascensionally up to all mammals or to any mammal, to all birds or to any bird, is impossible. Let a developmentist come point blank to his thesis; let him say at once and roundly that an elephant is simply an improved eel, or an eagle is simply an improved flounder; or let him grasp his subject in the mass, and hold it up *in toto;* let him say at once and roundly that men are simply far-off improved oysters, flies, sea-nettles, ants, grasses, lichens, and he will not be troubled with any argument in reply. His hearers will merely cry, Whence came he? Whence came *he?*

Again, the ascension of species, according to the development theory, requires that it should have had one axis from beginning to end, or that it should have made distribution of all the successive species from one centre. But the account of creation as given in Scripture and the account of creation as gathered from observation accord exactly with the distribution both of extinct species as found in the rocks, and of extant species as found throughout the world's surface. The doctrine

Digitized by Google

which these accounts teach is the doctrine of special creations, or that each species separately came into being by fiat of the Creator; and that doctrine answers exactly to the facts that extinct species differed widely from one another in extent of range, that extinct species differed widely from one another also in centres and circumstances of origin, that new extinct species are suddenly found on the hither side of great gaps in the fossiliferous ascent, that both extinct species and extant ones were fitted at once and fully for limited localities and peculiar kinds of habitat, and that extant species exist in such exceeding diversity of distribution, in regard to at once centre, extent, and quality, as to render the study of the geography of the flora and fauna almost as intricate as the study of their structure. But all these facts are fatal to the development theory. One fact, indeed, might at first sight seem to comport with it—that monads are everywhere and men are almost everywhere—monads at the bottom of the series and men at the top; yet even that fact could be made suitable only by being read, as it cannot be read, monads *were* everywhere and men *are* everywhere. All the other facts, both in a general way and in the details severally under them, are irreconcilable with the notion of any possible formative or generative ascension of species. Think of such ascension how we may, or allow to it whatever conceivable variety or fitfulness of action we can, we are unable to imagine it as working otherwise than along one groove or up one axis. Or if, *e.g.*, we should let it be figured as having made fresh starts laterally from two or more parts of a species, so as to have made the growth of the organic world somewhat like that represented in a genealogical tree, even then it

Digitized by Google

would be roundly contradicted by the facts of botanical and zoological geography. Let one example be taken for illustration. The three families of fishes, the sturgeons, the siluroids, and the goniodonts, so similar to one another in certain features and so dissimilar in others, present to a theorist such an appearance of inter-connected origination as he might interpret either vertically or laterally, and yet exist in such distribution as proves that each of the three had a separate origin. The siluroids are very sparse in the northern hemisphere, where the sturgeons abound, but are very numerous in the southern hemisphere, where the sturgeons are altogether awanting; and they exist along with the goniodonts in every part of South America, but entirely without the goniodonts in any other part of the world. If all three had an axial or ascensive origin, they could not possibly exist in such markedly separate specific distribution; or if the siluroids and the goniodonts sprang separately or laterally from the sturgeons, they could not be found completely separate from them, the former throughout the southern hemisphere, the latter in South America; or if the siluroids sprang from the goniodonts, they must have been confined to South America, where alone the goniodonts are. Agassiz, from whom we have borrowed this illustration, and who gave it to his assistants on their way to Brazil in 1868, expressed a conviction in reference to his intended researches in South America—researches which far more than realized all his anticipations—"that the combination of animals on that continent, where the faunæ are so characteristic and so distinct from all others, would give him the means of showing that the development theory is wholly without foundation in facts."

Digitized by Google

Again, the ascension of species, according to the development theory, must have required for its accomplishment a length of time far beyond what known facts or sound reasonings can admit. The demand on time by the most accepted developmentists is not less than three hundred millions of years; and by some others is much more. That demand might readily be admitted, if only the eternal self-existence of the Creator were considered; but it must be tested and measured, not by any consideration of eternity, but only by consideration of time, and therefore only by appeal to such material facts as have a bearing upon the question. No one of these facts is of such a kind as to show precisely how many years must have passed since the earth began to produce plants, or to be a seat of organic life; yet all are sufficiently determinate to show a maximum number of years. Nor are any so simple and untechnical as to admit of being roundly stated within the narrow limits at our disposal; yet all are plain enough to admit of being distinctly indicated. One fact or group of facts is reached through astronomy, in reference to the relations between the sun and the planets; another is reached through dynamics, in reference to the earth's rates of motion; another is reached through chemistry, in reference to radiation of heat and to crystallization; another is reached through lithological geology, in reference to the superposition of rocks in the earth's crust, lighter ones beneath heavier ones; another is reached through palæontology, in reference to the suddenness of transition from swarms of a preceding species to swarms of a succeeding one; another is reached through seismology, in reference to the phenomena of upheavals and subsidences; and another is reached through a combination of the

Digitized by Google

sciences, from mineralogy up to georgy, in reference to the formation and the functions of soil. The facts give different voices, or voices differently heard by different ears; but they all speak distinctly, with some effect or other; and not one of them admits a maximum of years more than one-fourth of what the most accepted form of the development theory requires. Take them in the average, and strike a medium between their maxima and their minima, and they will not yield one-tenth of what it requires. Yet it has not a single fact, nor the shadow of a fact, to oppose to them; it offers nothing to confront them, and can offer nothing, except a baseless postulate; and therefore it is proved by them to be false.

Again, the ascension of organic beings, first out of lifeless matter and then upward formatively from lower species to higher, is disproved by the origination of entirely new things at successive stages of the progress. What about the transition from the inorganic species to the organic? That, as admitted by all the developmentists themselves except the evolutionists, was not a progression of one thing onward, but a clear leap from one kind of thing to a totally different kind. What about life? That again, as admitted by all developmentists themselves except the evolutionists, was an entirely new thing, manifestly a creation; and, when once begun in plants, was not ascensional or expansive from species to species, but constant in each species and the same in all. What about animal life? That also was a new thing, or a thing with new powers, new functions, new organs, in total difference from vegetable life. What about reproductivity? That likewise was entirely new; possessed characters and produced effects totally different from any in mere minerals; appeared

Digitized by Google

universally, at once, and in full vigour, in all species of plants and in all species of animals, as they came successively into being; and never was ascensional through either the plants or the animals, but has always worked as uniformly and as prolifically in the lowest as in the highest, or rather has always been vigorous somewhat in the inverse ratio of the gradation of species, most prolific in the low and least prolific in the high. What about instinct and sensation? These again were new things, entirely different from everything in plants; and working in connection with new organisms and new chemistries. What about the higher animal mind, in its phases of sagacity and of semblances to reason? That also was a new thing; differed largely from everything in the earlier animals; existing only in association with very complicated organs, strikingly diversified even in animals of the same order, yet constant and peculiar in each group or species; and, while the seat of life or of functional force for the entire organic system of each individual is so distinct from that system, so demonstrably another thing from it, so evidently an essence by itself underivable from matter, that it abstracts not an atom of the physical substance of the system when itself passes away. What about man's intellect or his rational soul? That likewise was a new thing; has express and specific relation to the Divine moral government; expatiates on immaterial and illimitable things utterly beyond the sensation range of even the highest mammals next to man; involves progression, expansion, multiplication of thought and knowledge, both in individuals and in communities, entirely contrasted to the stationary instincts of all other animals; and resembles nothing, and could not have been derived from anything, as to either essence, function,

Digitized by Google

force, or tendency, in any energy of either mineral, plant, or lower animal, or in any conceivable number of all the three. Each one of these things—organic being, vegetable life, reproductivity, instinct, animal mind, human intellect—was a totally new thing in the history of the cosmos, entirely outside of any possible course of formative ascension ; and therefore all of them, severally and collectively, contradict and confute the development theory.

Again, the ascension of animal species, formatively or generatively, from the lowest upward to man, is disproved by the non-expansion and non-transmission of the most distinctive or most important characters of successive species. The development theory, in order to have the slightest show of truth, requires that the instincts, the sensation functions, the perceptive faculties, the motive powers of animals should have passed upward from species to species, ever enlarging and intensifying and refining, till they culminated in man. Have they done so ? On the contrary, some of them were as perfect on their first appearance as they ever became ; some went out with an early class, never to reappear in any subsequent class ; some were peculiar to intervening groups, neither coming to these from preceding groups nor passing on to succeeding ones ; many, though partly passing onward, went out of connection with important old organisms, and went into connection with widely different new ones ; and all are now seen in the retrospect—not like a river, flowing in one channel, fed only by springs in its own bed, and ever increasing in volume as it flows —but like a long chain of lakelets, connected only by intervening rills of superfluence, receiving the infall of many an independent stream, some of the lakelets con-

Digitized by Google

tributing nothing to the onward effluence, and each one distinct in itself, with a shape, a cincture, an ornature, and islets of its own. Every one of the animal species, from the first to the last, appears equipped as a separate creation, complete in itself, specific in instincts, in constitutional habitudes, in organic adaptations. The instincts of each, the sensation functions of each, all those powers in each which developmentists would have regarded as the germs of future intellect, promising to bud and fructify eventually into the human soul—all these remained fixed in each, were perfect at the very first in each, showed no capacity of enlargement in any, and belonged as distinctly or exclusively to each as did its distinctive or specific structural conformation. Man is classified with the vertebrates beneath him, mainly on account of his vertebræ and his perceptive organs; but he has a backbone itself exceedingly different both from the many-membered spinose backbone of fishes, and from the single-membered round backbone of birds; he has perceptive organs themselves, especially hands and nose and ears, exceedingly different from those of most or all of even the nearest mammals; and he has not either the swimming power of fishes, the creeping power of reptiles, the flying power of birds, the bounding power of antelopes, or any one of numerous other important powers of many species all upward from insect to ape. And as to sensation functions, or the things which most nearly concern his mental superiority, he cannot see like the eagle, or hear like the hare, or smell like the dog, or even discern prognostics of the weather like some of the very radiates. He, no doubt, is unspeakably nobler than the entire menagerie of the brutes beneath him; but he got his nobleness, with a character

Digitized by Google

of its own, directly from his Creator. He stands on the apex of the pyramid of organic being; but he did not grow there; he did not bud out of the mass of that pyramid into his exalted position; he was formed there and placed there immediately by God. His entire intellectual character proves him to have been a special creation, and therefore proves the development theory to be false.

Again, the origination of man out of quadrumana or monkeys is disproved by broad differences or total contrasts of fact between the quadrumana and men. First, no axial or connecting line lies between the two. The quadrumana constitute a number of genera, comprising very numerous species, and could not themselves have sprung ascensionally from any species below them; and even the three genera of them which have been pronounced anthropoidal, or possessed of characters presenting some resemblance to the human, are divergent from one another in their very alleged anthropoidism. These three are the chimpanzee, the ourang, and the gorilla; and they have been pleaded severally or separately as the ancestors of man; but they can be fancied to approach him only along divergent lines—the chimpanzee by structure of teeth and cranium, the ourang by structure of the brain, the gorilla by structure of the extremities; so that, in so far as they can be fancied to have grown toward him at all, they must have grown in three lines like the prongs of a trident, and could never unite. Next, no transition animal between any of the quadrumana and man either exists now or is alleged to have ever existed. The distance from even the chimpanzee's teeth and cranium to man's, from even the ourang's brain to man's, from even the gorilla's extremi-

Digitized by Google

ties to man's, taken each along its own line, is confessedly great—and taken all three to some point of convergence is inconceivably great; yet is not broken or divided by one single mark of transition. The distance, too, though it had been as short and simple a one as could possibly have lain between two adjacent distinct species, could not have failed, on the development hypothesis, to be traversed by a series of variations graduating progressively from monkey to man; yet it contains not now, and never has contained, a single member or even a trace of a single member of any such series. Let it be remembered, also, that the entire region of the quadrumana is crowded with diversities of species, and that the entire human region is crowded with diversities of variations; and the wide gap between the two will be seen as overwhelming evidence that man was a separate or special creation. Even a foremost evolutionist, very eminent for his knowledge of anatomy, has been obliged to say "that the structural differences between men and even the highest apes are great and significant; that every bone of a gorilla bears marks by which it might be distinguished from the corresponding bone of a man; and that, in the present creation at any rate, no intermediate link bridges over the gap between Homo and Troglodytes." Next, no progressive or ascensional line is apparent in the structure of even the human species itself. We leave out here, as to be noticed afterwards, considerations of race and of original mental condition. The question of general structure is not affected by these considerations; and that question requires, on the development hypothesis, that man's organization should originally have been nearer to the monkey organization than now, and should have progressed, through successive

Digitized by Google

generations, in a course of improvement. But, taken distributively, it has really undergone, and is continually undergoing, wide variations in all directions, backward, forward, sideways, hither and thither; while, taken aggregately, it was exactly at first what it is now, or exactly now what it was at first; and in either view, it confutes entirely the development theory. The smoothness of man's skin, the erectness of his locomotive conformation, the peculiar configuration of his foot, the exquisite organisms of his hand, the wonderful flexibilities of his organs of utterance, the remarkable play of his facial expression, and even the comparative largeness of his brain, together with other important characteristics of his structure, appear, as far as evidence about them is obtainable, to have been the same in the primeval ages as in the present age, and continue to be the same in the negro as in the Caucasian, and in the savage as in the savant. Next, the specific characteristics of man's organization all indicate a wide gap, a deep and total absence of relation, between quadrumanal mind and human intellect. Smoothness of skin, for example, points obviously to fabricating skill for the manufacture of clothing; erectness of posture, to contemplative observation of things on earth all around, and of things in the sky all upward from clouds to the stars; the form of the foot, to investigation, research, and business; the form of the hand, to the practice of all the arts, from the lowest of the common to the highest of the fine; the organs of utterance, to intercommunication of thought, and to literature and science; the nerves of the face, to "the feast of reason and the flow of soul;" the size and sensitiveness and functional force of the brain, to a powerful mastery in the use of all the

Digitized by Google

organs; and all the characteristics conjointly, to moral cognition, religious emotion, the recognizing and obeying and adoring of Almighty God. Next, the human intellect itself, even viewed apart from the specific organisms, exists entirely on the hither side of a profound gap separating it from quadrumanal mind. Life after the mineral epoch was not more evidently a new creation than human intellect after the quadrumanal epoch; and as the former is recognized as such by the developmentists proper in opposition to the evolutionists, so is the latter recognized as such by some recent developmentists in opposition to previous developmentists. Even granting, say these men, that mere physical forces built up the organic world from the first living creature to the highest of the apes, still another, a special, a direct act of the Creator alone, could originate the human intellect. Conviction has begun here entirely within the developmentists' own sphere of thinking, or entirely from examination of their own alleged facts; and, no doubt, it will go on even there, but especially by acceptance of light from wider spheres of thought, till it shall everywhere and for ever reject with indignant scorn the entire development theory.

Finally, the origination of man immediately out of quadrumana and remotely out of previous animals, is disproved by the facts of the outward action of mind. The growth of species out of species, according to the development theory, was a transmutation of lower organs into higher ones by the working of instinct or of mind toward adaptation to new external circumstances; and if growth occurred from monkey to man, it must have been accompanied by a perceptible commencement of such outward workings of the monkey mind as should

Digitized by Google

give indications of advancement toward the circumstances of man. Nor would these indications pass away from the monkeys when man should be fully formed; but they would remain deep and strong on at least such of them as should have become most anthropoidal. Now, is there any evidence of nascent social organization, political combination, national government, progressive aggregate experience, among monkeys? None. Yet there is, the theorists might say, a sort of germ of these things among gregarious animals—sheep, beavers, birds, fishes, insects. Yes, but these would show it in reverse order; they would show, not progress, but regress; they would show the thing, whatever it was, to have decreased, and not increased, as it got on toward the monkeys and toward man. Is there any evidence of constructiveness, of the making of roads, bridges, houses, towns, cities, among monkeys? None. Yet there is, the theorists might say, a sort of germ of these things among moles with their burrows, among beavers with their dams, among birds with their nests, among ants with their galleries, among bees with their honey-combs. Yes, but these again would show the thing, whatever it was, to have got very early "developed," and to have died out as it came along. Is there any evidence of fine art, science, literature, books, among monkeys? No, nor any evidence of anything which could be called a germ of them, among any animals prior to man. Yet, the theorists might say, there possibly may have been some germ of them, which geognostic action has effaced. Yes, possibly; and just as possibly may there have been, even prior to the time of the first fishes, a race of intellectual invertebrates too finely organized to have left any traces of their existence; and that again would go

Digitized by Google

all backward against development. But geognostic action would not efface statuary-work or parchment-work, or any similar work done by monkeys. Geognostic action has rarely been more destructive than at Herculaneum and Pompeii; yet it has embalmed there, in a matrix which might have preserved them full and, clear for many millenniums, a vast and varied collection of Roman works of artificership, household furnishings, sculpture, vertu, and even literature. Is there anywhere any trace of any initial things of a similar sort connected with monkeys, or with the entire gradation of lower animals? No; not an indication of even the slightest intellectual thing; not an indication anyhow, in even the faintest manner, that brute mind was developing toward human intellect. Lastly, is there any evidence of moral force, of conscience, of soul, of religious worship, among monkeys? Oh! the theorists may say, that question is extravagant; it asks for physical indications of a thing which is all emotion, and has no physical indications. Not so. A very broad physical indication of man's presence in the world, and vastly the most significant, is the action of his moral nature, his conscience, his soul, his religious worship, in the production of altars, temples, churches, cathedrals, symbolic sculptures, and all varieties of moral and religious writings. Could any approaches toward such things have existed among the animals prior to man, we might look for remains of them in places similar to the lava-accumulations of Vesuvius or the mounds of Nineveh. Nay more; if any approaches to such things could have existed among the monkeys immediately prior to the origin of man, we are entitled to look for them as actually existing among the monkeys still. The present anthropoids are from the same stock

Digitized by Google

as the anthropoids long ago ; they also, according to the development theory, ought to be more advanced in character than their ancestors ; and they, therefore, must exhibit in utmost strength whatever excellences their ancestors had. Yet they show not a particle, all the highest of them taken together show not a particle, of moral or religious outwork. No trace is discernible among them, in anything they do, of the remotest approach to faculty of conscience or faculty of adoring God. All of them are as far as the frogs and the fishes are from constructing anything, or doing anything, indicative of soul, of cognition of Deity, of looking toward immortality. Man's position relative to their position, in regard to all things indicative of moral nature, is not one of derivation, of progression, of improvement, or of comparative superiority, but one of total contrast. Religion with them is nowhere ; but with man is everywhere. It looks out from old monuments in solitary places ; it sits aloft on the grandest edifices in towns and cities ; it spreads away in large proportion of all the millions of things which have been penned or painted ; it gives gnomons of itself, as the master-force of human thought, in the very expression of almost every face ; and, what ought to strike developmentists as most awfully overwhelming to their theory and most solemnly appealing to their souls' interests, it shows, by the diversities of its monuments, its temples, its churches, its literature, and its facial indications, that it is a thing, not merely of a creature totally different in kind from monkeys, but of a creature who has fallen from his original condition, and is now heart-sick, conscience-stricken, consciously self-degraded, consciously guilty before God, and earnestly groping for a Divine method of restoration to his lost

Digitized by Google

rectitude and happiness. The entire comparison between man and the species that existed before him is evidence clear and strong, both that man was a separate creation, perfectly distinct from any previous creation, and that the epoch in which he lives is a powerfully peculiar epoch, saturated with moral influences, of immensely higher value than all other kinds of forces.

Yes, a peculiar epoch of moral influences! The origin of man as an animal, even the origin of man as a rational being, even the existence of man in the highest sense in which he personally exists, is not all the problem which savants have to study. The correlation of man, intellectually and morally, to all things which preceded him in the world, to all things which are around him in the world, and to all things which are future to him both here and hereafter—that also is part, and the main part, of the problem. The Bible not only records the creation of man as a special creation, but also records it as both the consummation of the previous terrestrial creations, and the commencement of a Divine peculiar moral administration over all things in time, with results to every individual human being for eternity. All the facts of true science also, and not least the facts of all departments of geology, concur to show, as the Bible shows, that the epoch of man, in its character of a moral epoch, was the goal toward which all precurrent physical things ran, the climax toward which they all rose, the completing and comprehensive end which all, in some manner or other, directly subserved. "This universe," as Dr. Stirling remarks, "is not an accidental cavity, in which an accidental dust has been accidentally swept into heaps, for the accidental evolution of the majestic spectacle of organic and inorganic life. That majestic spectacle

Digitized by Google

is a spectacle as plainly for the eye of reason as any diagram of the mathematician. That majestic spectacle could have been constructed, was constructed, only in reason, for reason, and by reason. From beyond Orion and the Pleiades, across the green hem of earth, up to the imperial personality of man, all the farthest, the deadest, the dustiest, is for fusion in the invisible point of the single Ego, which alone glorifies it." All of it is a manifestation of the Divine intelligence to the intelligence of man ; all of it is a manifestation of "the eternal power and Godhead" of the Creator, with the design that man may "know God and glorify him as God." Not a manifestation merely in the manner of lesson or teaching to rational and accountable man, but a manifestation to him also in the manner of benefits conferred upon him, in adaptation to his rational and accountable condition. The deposits of coal, the superpositions of rocks, the adjustments of metallic lodes, the distribution of land and sea, the configuration of coast-lines, the contour of hill and vale, the oxygenizement of the originally non-oxygenic atmosphere, are examples of characteristics of the earth, slowly and steadily produced throughout the long geological epochs, and presenting broad, rich, essential fitnesses for the play of man's moral intellect, as distinct and full as are the fitnesses of a house's apartments and furnishings for the inhabitation of a family. Other adaptations are everywhere, from the greatest things to the smallest. "The earth is full of the goodness of the Lord ;" full of His goodness as "loving righteousness and judgment ;" full of His goodness as having made and fitted it all, from the earliest epoch onward, in suitableness to His moral government over man.[1] The physical forces in the

[1] Psa. xxxiii. 5-9.

Digitized by Google

early cosmos were not one current of forces, all in one channel, with mere increase of depth and width, but thousands of currents crossing and recrossing one another, and often whirled into new directions, or carried into junction with new currents, possessed of new characters; they worked for a time on minerals only, for a time on plants also, for a time on animals of low type also, for a time on animals with high sensation forces also, and now on men with moral forces also; they have ever worked as surely throughout the entire cosmical system collectively, as within the system of any order or species of being separately; and now they exist and operate, strikingly indeed in their relations to all material things, and very strikingly in their relation to organic structure, but far more strikingly in their relations to rational mind, to contemplative intellect, to accountable soul, recognizing God, observing His moral glory, receiving and enjoying the effusions of His infinite love in the mission and work and reign of Christ.

Here is a stupendous fact which the development theory does not face, and cannot face. Here is the fact of man's origin, or man's existence, being identified with Divine moral government; or the fact that man's creation was not simply the creation of a species, but the creation of it "in the image of God." The development theory dares not face that fact, but flees from it as a mole or a bat would flee from a glory; and ever when approached by that fact, it is as Dagon when approached by the ark of the Lord; it "falls to the ground, and the head of Dagon and both the palms of his hands are cut off, and only the stump of Dagon is left to him."[1] Nothing better is it for the savants than was the fish-god

[1] 1 Sam. v. 1–4.

Digitized by Google

for the Philistines ; and not very different from it either; tapering from a fish's tail below to a man's bust above, but all spiritless, lifeless, meaningless, a hideous idol, and nothing more. Yet this ghastly nonentity, which has not one particle of reality in it, nor an eye to see one phasis of man's moral condition, nor a tongue to answer a single one of the many confounding proofs of its own absurdity—this grim, ghoulish, gibbering phantom is all, absolutely all, which unbelieving savants have to set forth as either an opponent of the truth, or a substitute for the truth, respecting the origin of man! Away with it then! be gone with it! and let us read again from the Holy Book, how it was that man began to be—"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness ; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them ; and God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. And God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good."[1]

The corollaries of the development theory are very many and very dismal ; but only three of them need be noticed, and these very briefly. First, the development theory gives its partizans a horrible view of their own condition. Did they fancy themselves to be actually ourangs or gorillas, they might be supposed to plead it for sake of acquiring the dignity of connection with man;

[1] Gen. i. 26–31.

Digitized by Google

but fancying themselves to be the descendants of monkeys, reptiles, radiates, herbs, sea-weeds, they must feel shocked at everything which reminds them of their supposed ancestors. Asaph, when forgetting only one feature of his moral nature, felt so abased in God's sight as to say, "I was as a beast before thee;"[1] but these men, round the entire circle of their thinking, must say literally and always, according to their own notions, "We are the offspring of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." How revolting to them—or mayhap how venerable—must be the sight of a gambolling ape or a crumbling fungus! Second, the development theory gives a most degrading view of human reason. This, according to that theory, is no other and no more than the upgrowth or outcome of the vital principle in plants and brutes; and, therefore, as existing in man, differs only in degree from sheer vitality as existing in plants and brutes. The reason and the vitality are the same thing; and this is high in an individual man as compared to what it is in an individual plant or an individual brute. But let thousands of plants and hundreds of brutes be taken together, and will not the aggregate of their vitalities be equal, or more than equal, to the vitality of only one man? Let, therefore, a solution of any question in art or science or ethics be got from all the plants of a botanic garden, and all the beasts of a menagerie, and will it not be as clear, as rational, as highly intelligent as a solution of the question by an individual man? Does this confounding of reason with vitality explain why some ancient fools worshipped leeks and crocodiles, and why some modern savants imagine themselves to be the descendants of all sorts of brutes and plants? And

[1] Psa. lxxiii. 22.

Digitized by Google

as the developmentists say they are the descendants of brutes, so the development theory is set forth as the outgrowth of sheer brute vitality. Let it therefore go to the brutes. It cannot be fit for rational beings. Third, the development theory is a strong proof, among many other strong ones, of the necessity of revelation. The partizans of it are the most fearless, thorough, and consistent of all the rejectors of the Bible; and they not only reject it, but also do their utmost to give us instead of it the best possible thing they can find. They proclaim mere reason to be sufficient for us, and the only guide worthy of us; and they possess the highest advantages for drawing out and setting forth the best teachings which it can afford. They are learned; they are scientific; they are strongly intellectual; they know all things which ancient philosophy taught, or which modern science has discovered; they co-operate powerfully with one another; they are far from being ignorant of the Bible itself; they have examined, or profess to have examined, such of its statements as appear to them undeserving of belief; they conduct their investigations and publish their conclusions openly, boldly, and deliberately; they are the very hierophants of reason, standing by its altar, fervent in its service, and enthusiastic for its honour; and they have succeeded perfectly in extracting, exhibiting, and illustrating the highest wisdom which mere reason can produce. And what is that wisdom? What says it about man and about his destiny? What inspiritment does it give to his actions and his hopes? It says summarily that man is the descendant of a monkey; that he is mentally or spiritually the same in kind as a mushroom or a tadpole; and that he lives the life of a brute while he lives, and dies the death of a

Digitized by Google

brute when he dies! Can any proof be a stronger proof of anything than this is that man needs a revelation? Nay, is not this a proof that an actual revelation is in the world, and alone has kept men in possession of their very reason? Had only this "wisdom," or such "wisdom" as this, been all along among them, how surely would every ray of intelligence, every thrill of expectation, every throb of virtue, every emotion of the real human breast have become extinct! No, not properly extinct, but entirely transmuted. For how surely would all have licked in the fire of devilry, and blazed into another hell! Most devoutly grateful to the infinitely beneficent Creator ought all men to be that we have a revelation; that we have it clear and full; that we have it in terms explaining how man was created at first, and how he may be created anew; how he fell headlong into pravity and folly, and how he may be raised again to a higher excellence and a grander wisdom than he lost! How fervently grateful ought all men to be that "God, at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, and hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds; who being the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high!"[1]

Behold now what the advocates of the development theory mean by Nature. The evolution men, as we formerly saw, mean, by their talk about Nature, to deny God's existence, to deny a First Cause, to deny the

[1] Heb. i. 1-3.

Digitized by Google

existence of anything but matter, and to give no clear account of even that; they constructively make Nature to be nothing. The other theorists differ widely among themselves, insomuch that some three or more of them, while all talking formally about Nature, are severally talking really about widely different things; but all mean, in all their talk about Nature, to deny God's special creations, to deny His providence, and either to deny or to ignore His moral government; most mean to withdraw attention from direct Divine agency, and to fix it solely on what they call "natural laws;" and even the least erroneous of them, though possessing in their own minds some sort of theistic faith, often write in terms or with a tendency as if their aims were to extinguish that faith in the minds of others. These latter may not advert to the moral effect of what they say; they may even wish their readers to understand expressions about Nature to mean expressions about God; yet, both by their association with atheists in their theory, and by their want of care to give a distinct theistic character to their own language, they stand on the side and do the work of infidels. What, then, is got from views of Nature in connexion with the development theory! First, nonsense in room of science; next, atheism or deism in room of Christianity—or, first, darkness to the intellect; next, intense darkness to the soul.

3. We now go on to look at the general views which identify Nature with God. These are held, among many others, by the quasi-theistic advocates of transmutation of organic species; but, except as held by them, they have a wide and very diversified range, and are not held in connexion with any theory. They are, strictly speak-

Digitized by Google

ing, not views at all, but rather modes of expression for modifying views or for other purposes. They consist in using the words "Nature" and "natural" to cover certain abnegations of doctrine, to avoid the ordinary or frequent use of the names of Deity, or to denote certain distinctions of theological belief. Any lengthened notice of them here is not necessary for our progress toward our subsequent chapters; and yet a brief notice of them here, followed by incidental remarks relating to them afterwards, is requisite for some parts of the great object at which we aim—to show that the voice of God in His works and in His word are one.

One wrong general use of the word "Nature," then, is designed to deny God's providence, or to acknowledge Him only as Creator. It speaks either of God or of Nature in reference to the works of creation; but speaks of Nature only, or of natural laws, in reference to the works of providence. It is sometimes infidel, to the extent of rejecting the Bible, and denying the possibility of a revelation; sometimes no more than Socinian, to the extent of rejecting providence and impugning miracles. The gist of it, in either case, is, while ascribing the origin of things to God, to ascribe the continuance of them, or the government of the world, to inherent forces infused into them at their creation and called the laws of Nature. The notion conveyed or covered by it is often set forth strongly as a separate doctrine, often placed in opposition to what are commonly held as the teachings of the Bible, and often made the subject of lengthened declamation, and amounts simply, as regards the government of the world, to a substitution of inherent forces for God. These forces, and not God, are always what it means by Nature, in reference to any

Digitized by Google

Divine works subsequent to primary creation ; and they are sometimes liable to be taken for what it means by Nature, in reference also to some aspects of primary creation itself. The notion is strikingly self-inconsistent and incongruous. Origination, accompanied by infusion of governing forces, is, for all practical results, or for all permanences, behaviours, or changes in the world's structure or constituences, substantially the same as both origination and government. The *pre*vision assumed by it in the infusion of governing forces, involves all the same effects as the *super*vision included in the notion of Divine providence ; and if either be more wonderful than the other, it is the *pre*vision doing once and for ever effectively all the things which, according to the doctrine of Divine providence, are done successively by the *super*vision. But a consideration of the subject, in its various bearings, will be carried out in our chapters on the Supernatural, Providence, and Miracles.

Another wrong general use of the word "Nature" is to employ it, in a loose or indefinite way, as a synonym for the word "God." The mere synonym, or the mere using of the word "Nature" as a name for God, might not seem to be wrong ; nay, seems to many Christians to be perfectly right ; nay, has been pleaded by some as an avoiding of irreverence by too frequent mention of the sacred name, and as therefore positively good or at least negatively devout. But it really does great harm, and does so in many ways. It sanctions the awful misuse of the word "Nature" by atheists and deists ; it covers any amount of looseness, indefiniteness, or diversity of thought in statements about Divine agency ; it may be now deistical, now Socinian, now evangelical, evincing artifice by sending forth waters bitter, salt, sweet ; it

Digitized by Google

separates recognition of God in His works from recognition of God in His word; it hides from view the connexions and reciprocities between the physical things of God's government and the moral things of Messiah's reign; it hinders or prevents the effusion of devout Christian thought into the contemplation of God's visible works. No man who speaks currently of Nature, even when distinctly wishing himself to be understood as speaking of God, rises readily to the altitude of David, when he said, "O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth! who hast set Thy glory above the heavens."[1] Even writers who announce themselves as aiming at high devotion by speaking of God under the name of Nature, seldom or never "mount up with wings as eagles."[2] They do not soar with their subject to lofty views of the Divine glory. They flutter easily, like the duck, among puddles; but cannot fly, like the lark, into the empyrean. They sometimes have speed of motion with aid of wing; but they have it, like the ostrich, on the flat earth, amid desert scenes. They want the force which bears the soul aloft. They either think of God in reference to His physical agency only, or have their thoughts upon His moral glory densely clouded by their talk about Nature. They do not speak spiritually or spiritually enough; or do not exhale sufficiently the animus of persons who worship in spirit and in truth.[3] They so engross themselves with the materialisms of their topics as to forget much of the Divine pervading spirit. They burrow far into materialistic phraseology, and leave largely behind them the phraseology of devotion. They pass, perhaps inadvertently, into the use of hundreds of expressions very

[1] Psa. viii. 1. [2] Isa. xl. 31. [3] John iv. 24.

Digitized by Google

earthly, very rough, positively irreverent, such as seem to them appropriately applied to Nature, but which they would not and could not, in prayer or in hymnody, apply to God. They evince themselves, by the employment of these and by the absence of devout fervour, to have essentially different thoughts altogether, when they speak currently of Nature, from such as they would have if they spoke directly of God. They manifestly feel, in their expatiations on Nature, that they are not contemplating God as "God in Christ."[1] They manifestly feel, too, that they are not contemplating Christ Himself as "the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto."[2] They practically, in fact, though unconsciously to themselves, are not Christian writers, but naturalistic writers. Here, then, is a seemingly very small wrong spark; a seemingly very small misuse of the tongue; a seemingly mere employment of synonym; nothing more than the use of the word "Nature" in lieu of the word "God." But see "how great a matter a little fire kindleth!"[3] That spark blazes into scorching flame on the men themselves who strike it; and it originates there a conflagration which may spread far and wide among their readers. Let devout persons, in considering the works of God, as in everything else, do according to the Scriptures. Surpassingly rich and plentiful are passages there on the physical works of God, but not a syllable on works of Nature.

Another wrong use of the word "Nature," essentially the same in kind and the same in effect as the last, is the employment of it as a synonym for the phrase

[1] 2 Cor. v. 19. [2] 1 Tim. vi. 14–16. [3] James iii. 5.

Digitized by Google

"works of God." We need not have named it separately, except to notice a mischievous expression or two, highly fashionable among many Christians. "The face of Nature," or "the beauties of Nature"—can there be anything amiss in saying that? A Christian, no doubt, may say it in a Christian sense; but an atheist also may say it in an atheistic sense. "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"[1] Discussion on the works of God is now a great controversy, with most momentous issues, between Christian and infidel; and the trumpet-note of it, on the one side, is "works of God," on the other side, "works of Nature." The Christian will not fight on the infidel's side; but if he blow the infidel's trumpet-note, he may draw to the infidel some wavering troops. "Looking up through Nature to Nature's God"—anything wrong in saying that? God is acknowledged there. Yes; but Nature is acknowledged too, and is represented as away downward and apart from God. The expression is thought, by those who use it, to be poetical; but it has the craziness about it which rants and raves in many a piece of spasmodic rhymes. It wants distinct sense. Take it to mean that all God's works show His glory, and you put sound sense into it; but take it to mean, as multitudes are sure to take it to mean, that "natural laws" do what Christians believe Divine providence to do, and you place it as a gun in the masked battery of infidels. All similar phrases are similarly bad. Not one of them is harmless; and not one which can have a good meaning imposed on it but may readily give place to some other phrase which expresses that meaning directly and

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 8.

Digitized by Google

clearly. Why not talk expressly of the works of God whenever the works of God are meant? Or why not speak of minerals, instead of Inorganic Nature? of minerals and plants, instead of Inanimate Nature? of plants and animals, instead of Organic Nature? of animals, instead of Animated Nature.

"Another wrong use of the words "Nature" and "natural," is to identify them with exclusively the physical works of God, in contradistinction to His moral works. The physical works themselves, as works, may harmlessly enough, or even usefully, be distinguished from the moral works. Natural philosophy, for example, is a fair designation of the science or study of God's physical works, in contradistinction to moral philosophy, or the science or study of part of His moral works. Yet even that, though guarded from misinterpretation by long definite usage, would do better to be written physical philosophy. The physical works of God, whenever or however distinguished from His moral works, ought never to be called natural, but always physical. And even under that name, or under any name, except when they are viewed as works for specific study, they are never to be distinguished at all from the moral works. To treat them separately with regard to God's government over the world, or as the basis or sphere of some religion different from revealed religion, is inevitably to involve great, sweeping, tremendous untruth. God is then mentioned as "the God of Nature;" and He then, under that name, is represented as considerably different from the God of Revelation. His manifestations of Himself in His physical works are regarded as considerably different from His manifestations of Himself in His moral works. His very oneness,

Digitized by Google

His very identity, is more or less impugned. Language is used, illustrations given, lessons taught as if "the God of Nature" were one God, and the God of the Bible another God. Some pietists, even some preachers, occasionally make the difference so great as to exclude the former from their faith, and to denounce the study of His works; and so habituated do a few of them become to the separating of the God of the physical works from the God of the moral ones, that they actually go on, in some degree, though unconsciously no doubt, to separate also the God of the Old Testament from the God of the New Testament. But God is One. He is the same in all His works, all His manifestations, all His word. The song of creation and the song of redemption, as sung by the redeemed in heaven, is one song. The revelation of the work of creation and of the work of Christ, both as shining from all that God has done, and as shining from all that God has said, is one revelation.

A very grievous wrong use of the word "natural" is to conjoin it with the words "religion" and "theology," so as to speak of natural religion in contradistinction to revealed religion, and of natural theology in contradistinction to dogmatic, didactic, and practical theology. Systematizing has constructed many an engine against Christianity; but never, perhaps, did it construct a stronger one than when it manufactured natural religion. Natural religion! The very phrase is a horror; yet, bad as it is in any case, it is not so bad in its ordinary, actual use as strict interpretation would make it. Natural religion—if there could be such a thing—according to grammatical interpretation of the phrase, would be the religion of what the English Bible terms, "a natural

Digitized by Google

man," and would be either a contradiction within itself, or at best a thing of enmity against God.[1] The nearest actual approach to it is the so-called religion of the Comtists, a thing of some forms, but really no religion at all; or rather a thing entirely antagonistic to religion, resting avowedly on sheer materialism, repudiating every notion of a God, and consisting in homage done by its votaries to such men as they may most admire. Another approach to a religion of Nature might be made by those theorists who imagine themselves to be descendants of quadrupeds and reptiles; and this might take the form of doing honour to their ancestors, and therefore might consist, like part of the ancient Egyptian heathenism, in rendering homage to cats and crocodiles. But even natural religion, taken in the much less offensive sense in which men commonly understand it, as a religious exposition of the physical works of God, separately from His moral works, is pregnant with evil, gives defective or distorted views of the Divine character, cuts asunder the connexions of creation with Christ and Christianity, flings a shower of blots on all parts of the teachings of the Bible.

What are the Bible's teachings? and how do they affect any ordinary or possible view of natural religion? They begin with a narrative of the creation; they mingle views of God's physical works, or allusions to them, the orbs of heaven, the atmosphere, the earth, minerals, plants, and animals, with their histories, their prophecies, their psalms, their ethics, their doctrines, their entire tissue; they identify these works expressly and often with Christ as Creator and Redeemer; they distinguish never, as to manifestations of the Divine

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 14; Rom. viii. 7.

Digitized by Google

glory, or as to the quality of impression these should make on man, between works physical and works moral; they conjoin everywhere the facts respecting creation with the facts respecting redemption. They say, speaking of Christ, "By Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, and by Him all things consist." "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made." "Who being the brightness of God's glory and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when he had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."[1] Religion then, is one. True religion sees the display of God in His work and the display of God in His word as one display; hears the voice of the works and the voice of the word as one voice; looks at creation, not as manifesting God apart from His scheme of redemption, but as manifesting God in Christ; and regards the Bible, not as revealing God apart from His physical works and His providence, but as revealing Him in every one of His relations to the world, and as therefore a revelation from "the Creator of the ends of the earth"—"from Him who was, and who is, and who is to come, and from the seven Spirits which are before His throne, and from Jesus Christ who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth."[2] We shall resume this subject in our chapter on Creation.

But see what a ruffian any error respecting Nature is; see how it drags its victims headlong to disaster. Christian men, evangelical preachers, some of the

[1] Col. i. 16, 17; John i. 3; Heb. i. 3.
[2] Isa. xl. 28–31; Rev. i. 4, 5.

Digitized by Google

stoutest professed advocates of evangelical truth, having once got to talk of Nature and of natural religion, when they ought to be talking of God and of Christ's gospel, are hurled downward to talk of Nature also in regard to the Divine moral government, the Divine will for man's duty, the very commandments of the decalogue. You will find them systematizing here, as you found them systematizing there; you will find them introducing Nature in relation to God's moral government here, as you found them introducing it in relation to His physical works there; you will find them setting forth a natural morality here, as you found them setting forth a natural religion there. They rule off certain commandments of the decalogue as what they call provincial laws; they rule off certain others as what they call imperial laws; they ascribe the so-called provincial laws only to the will of God; and they assign the so-called imperial laws to Nature! They do not tell you what Nature is as apart from God; they, of course, do not really mean that it is anything at all; yet they speak of it as the source of what they call the imperial laws, and speak of God as having adopted these laws from it; and then, in words at least, they make Nature to be a different power or different authority from God, and represent it as a Divine law-maker. They, no doubt, revolt from such a notion, and are as far from meaning it as we are. But their readers or their hearers may not all give them credit, as we do, for intentionally sound thinking. Some of these may take the words as they are; may construe them logically; may run off from them into any amount of speculation about Nature; may not even run from them, but only take one step from them to the conclusion that, since Nature is so wondrous a power in moral

Digitized by Google

things, it must likewise be a wondrous power in physical things. And how came our evangelical men to go so dismally wrong, even in words, about the commandments? Does not God say, in reference to the covenant of salvation, confirmed by the blood of Christ, "This is the covenant, I will put My laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts"?[1] Have not all the commandments of the decalogue one preface, one sanction, one lawgiver? and are they not the very "laws" of the covenant, written first on the old covenant's "tables of stone," and next on the new covenant's "fleshy tables of the heart"?[2] Religion, then, we again say, is one. All true things in ethics and all true things in physics are in unison with "the glorious gospel of Christ."

II. We come now to speak of special views of nature.[3] These, like the general views, are numerous and conflicting; and some of them include several shades of difference; but only three of them are right. A chief one takes nature to mean the original state of man, and ascribes to that state characters widely different from those which are ascribed to it in the Bible. Another, of considerable prominence, takes it to mean an unperverted or right moral state of man, in contrast to a perverted or wrong state. Another, of wide and various scope, takes it to mean the native state of minerals, plants, and animals. Another, of the highest moment, takes it to mean the native moral state of fallen man, in contrast to a Christianized, converted, or spiritual state. And another takes it, with addition of a distinctive epithet, to mean, conversely to the preceding, the renovated or spiritual state of true Christians.

[1] Heb. viii. 10. [2] Heb. viii. 7–12; 2 Cor. iii. 3.

[3] We have too long written the word "Nature" with a capital N., we are henceforth going to write it with a small *n*.

Digitized by Google

1. We notice, first, the view which takes nature to mean the original state of man, and ascribes to that state characters widely different from those which are ascribed to it in the Bible. This view figures largely in a recent system, claiming to be a science, and calling itself anthropology or the science of man; it often is mixed, more or less, with the theories of evolution and development; and it splits sharply and extensively into gradations, diversities, and contrarieties of opinion among those who maintain it. One feature of it is the alleged origination of man in some other way than by special creation; and this is generally identical with either the evolution or the development theory. Another feature is the assigning to man an antiquity very long prior to that which any deductions hitherto made from the Bible assign to Adam; and this has been much combined with palæontology and archæology, and is elicited chiefly from statements respecting certain organic remains and certain rude implements found in geognostic positions alleged to be much older than those of the period commonly assigned to the lifetime of Adam. A third feature is alleged plurality in the types and primary pairs of original man, and this has been much mixed with what is called natural history and with ethnology, and is attempted to be traced into a plurality of races in existing mankind. A fourth feature takes nature to mean the savage state of man in contrast to his civilized state; and this assumes man to have been originally a savage—to have originally had no speech, no science, no religion—to have even not had more than the smallest modicum of human brains—to have progressed onward and upward to a better state—to have invented speech, arts, science, and religion—and to have eventually formed

Digitized by Google

various tribes, some ceasing to progress at only a few stages from the original savageism, and some continuing to move on toward high civilization. The entire view is regarded by its advocates as very extensively exhibiting what they call nature; and it will be discussed, as to all its four features, in our chapter on the Human Race.

2. We notice, next, the view of nature which takes it to mean an unperverted or right state of man, in contrast to a perverted or wrong state. This is indefinite, and has several shades, but may be regarded as twofold. One form of it identifies nature with good moral principle; another identifies it with the sum of the instinctive animal affections; and the former is erroneous, the latter correct.

The notion of identifying nature with good moral principle is generally very hazy, seldom or never systematic, far more conventional than formal, and current rather among loose talkers than among close thinkers. Yet it exists very largely, and exerts powerful influence on domestic and social morals. Many persons who hold it seem to be unconscious of holding it, or seem never to have analyzed it, or, at least, never speak of it as they would speak of a tenet which they believe or of a principle which they have investigated, and yet act upon it with a firmness, and carry it out with a perseverance, as if it were one of the best known and most incontrovertible of cardinal truths. Let them, for example, have to deal with three young boys, of widely different dispositions; let them observe one of the boys to be fond of money, another fond of fighting, another fond of watching the phenomena of the garden, or one to be covetous, another combative, another contemplative; and they will pronounce all three to be right, to differ

Digitized by Google

only in having different "natures," and each to require solely and strictly the developing of his own "bent," in order to his becoming a good man—the first a good merchant, the second a good soldier, the third a good student. They assume the essence of all goodness to be "naturally" in every child; they suppose it merely to take different shapes, all alike good, in different children; they believe the direct and sheer developing of it to be the entire work of right training, both at home and at school; and they pronounce divergence from it or thwarting of it, to be the sole cause of any wrong habits which may be formed, or of any moral evils which may arise. Nature, with them, is nothing less than the fountain-head of virtue; and departure from nature the only road to vice. Need we say that all the teachings of experience, of history, and of the Bible contradict them? Need we say that most of themselves eventually learn, bitterly and plenteously, from even their own experience and observation, perhaps to their heavy cost, that they have been completely wrong? They are chiefly young persons, never men of much reflection; and they soon discover that "foolishness is bound in the heart of a child;" [1] that "the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked;" [2] that "out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies, and they defile a man." [3] To set up an abstraction, under the name of nature, as creator and governor of the world, is very bad; and to set up a fancy under the name of nature, as the source of moral goodness in man, is no better. Only God, as made known in Christ, is creator and governor of the world; and only the Holy

[1] Prov. xxii. 15. [2] Jer. xvii. 9. [3] Matt. xv. 19, 20.

Digitized by Google

Spirit, through the mediation of Christ, is the renovator or beautifier of the human heart.[1]

All talk, then, about "natural" thoughts or actions being good, and "unnatural" thoughts or actions being bad, when understood in the moral sense, is erroneous. But appeal upon it is sometimes made to the Bible. We are asked to look at the passage which describe the wicked men who should arise in "perilous times" as men "without natural affection."[2] But the words "without natural affection" there are only in the English translations; are wholly unwarranted; have nothing whatever corresponding to them in the Greek. We are asked again to look at the passage which describes the ancient heathens as persons "without natural affection."[3] The same words, there, indeed, are not quite unwarrantable; yet they are rather an exposition of the Greek than a translation. The Greek there says nothing about either "nature" or "natural;" but is simply an adjective designating the absence of such instinctive affection between parents and offspring as exists constitutionally in all animals. Has that instinctive affection anything to do with morals? or can that be called the fountain-head of any moral good—of all moral good? Yet, observe, even that was awanting in the old heathens—aye, even in some of the grandees of the imperial city, to which the epistle containing the passage was sent. How came they to be so brutal?—no, not brutal, but so much worse than brutal—to want the instinctive affection, as between parents and offspring, which all brutes possess? Was it from development of "nature" in them? from such training as brought fully out "the natural bent" of their

[1] John iii. 3–8; 1 Cor. vi. 9–11; Gal. v. 16–25.
[2] 2 Tim. iii. 3. [3] Rom. i. 31.

Digitized by Google

mind? Then was their "nature," their proper human nature, their nature as human beings descended from fallen Adam, and not renovated by the Holy Spirit through the gospel of Christ, an unholy nature producing only vice and crime.

The other form of the view we are now considering—the form which identifies nature with the sum of the instinctive affections in animals—regards their *nature* as only a property, function, or characteristic of their *native state.* Nature, in this light, is nothing moral, nothing productive, not even anything substantial; nor is it in the least peculiar to man, but shared by him in common with the lower animals. It belongs, not to the moral sense, not to reason, not to intellect, but to the mere animal mind, and has the same rank as sensation, perception, sexual emotion, hunger, and thirst. Its only peculiarity in man is association with reason and his other higher powers, and its capability of being controlled by these, either into a finer exercise than occurs among the lower animals, or into such debasement or perversion as may defeat its objects or extinguish its existence. A bad man may pervert his other instincts to the purposes of depravity; may enthral his functions of hunger, thirst, and taste, into subserviency to gluttony; may abuse his capacities of reproduction into a maintenance of gross immorality; and may, in the same way, either over-stimulate his natural affection till it becomes "inordinate," and his children are made pampered pets, or starve it down till it becomes extinct, and his children are maltreated or abandoned. A brute does nothing of this sort. Its nature, or native instincts, or constitutional desires, prompt it always to pursue the right course for both its own health and that of its offspring. It neither

Digitized by Google

pampers its young nor neglects them; neither turns them off to shift for themselves too soon, nor retains them too long; and never, during the time of their needing its help or protection, abandons them. Hence the enormity of any man's guilt who is "without natural affection." He is worse than any brute would be if it could and did relinquish its care for its offspring. He not only has resisted his own higher powers of reason and conscience, which ought to have armed him with a higher care for his higher offspring, but he has employed his reason to enfeeble and destroy the very instinctive love which he possessed in common with the brutes. Yet that instinctive love, we say again, is no part of moral principle, no ingredient in moral excellence; it is mere "nature," a mere native property of sentient beings, a mere concomitant of reproductiveness in animals; and it is proved to be so by its existing as fully in the wild beast of the forest as in the most highly civilized man.

3. We notice, next, the view of nature which takes it to mean the native state of minerals, plants, and animals. This view is clear, sound, and important. It is the one correct view of nature in regard to physical things. It is the one correct view of nature in the material world which all correct thinkers originally took; it was perverted, by careless or fallacious use of its terms, into most of the wrong views which we have been discussing; and often it is made dexterously, or rather sinistrously, to conceal the delusion of these views by a compounding of its terms with theirs. But it means no more than the native state of minerals, plants, and animals, as distinguished from a manipulated or artificial state. A natural mineral of any species is simply that mineral in its native state, as distinguished from the same mineral

Digitized by Google

after being altered by chemical action, or by any other transmuting force. A natural plant is simply any species of plant in its native state, as distinguished from the same plant in an altered state of growing, flowering, or fruiting induced by the arts of cultivation. A natural animal is simply any species of animal in its native state, as distinguished from the same animal in a state of domestication. Natural functions and natural uses, in the same way, are functions and uses of a creature accordantly with its native state, as distinguished from alterations of them by art or device.

Several instances of the use of the words nature and natural, in this view, occur in the Bible. One is in Rom. xi. 24.: "For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree, which is wild by nature, and wert graffed contrary to nature into a good olive tree, how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be graffed into their own olive tree." Here the Gentile is compared to the branch of a wild olive tree, the Jew to the branch of a cultivated olive tree; each is said to have had his respective position by nature, because that position was his native state; and the Gentile's admission to the church of God is compared to the grafting of a wild olive twig into a cultivated olive trunk contrary to nature, because his new position, like the new position of the grafted olive twig, is a position in contrast to that of the native state. Another instance is in Gal. ii. 15.: "We are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles." Here Jews who were born "Hebrews of the Hebrews" are designated as Jews by nature simply for the reason that to be "Hebrews of the Hebrews," and not members of any heathen nation, was their native state. Another instance is in Gal. iv. 8.: "Howbeit then, when ye knew

Digitized by Google

not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods." Here the gods of the heathens, or at least such of them as the Galatians had once worshipped, are described as by nature no gods, to show that these objects of worship were not such by native condition, but were made such by art or man's device, either in transmutation of stocks and stones, or in deification of prominent or heroic men. Another instance is in 2 Pet. ii. 12: "These, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption." Here bold perverters of true religion are compared to natural brute beasts, or more literally to natural animals in the condition in which they were born, or to the wild beasts of the chase, for the reason that the native state of these animals is "to be taken and destroyed," and that the native state of the perverters of religion, considered in its moral aspects, is, as we shall afterwards see, a state of sin and condemnation. Another instance is in Jude 10: "These speak evil of those things which they know not; but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves." Here the meaning is substantially the same as in the preceding. Wicked men, by following out their native bent, as wild animals follow out their native bent, pass on to destruction. Another instance, though not apparent in the English version, is in Jas. iii. 7: "Every kind of beasts and of birds and of serpents and of things in the sea is tamed, and hath been tamed of mankind;" more literally, "Every nature of beasts and of birds and of serpents and of things in the sea is tamed and hath been tamed by human nature." Here wild animals are indicated to be what they are

Digitized by Google

simply by native state; and animal man, as an animal overpowering and taming the wild animals, is indicated to be what he is in that respect simply by native state. Another instance, which we need not quote, and which cannot be mistaken as to its meaning, is in Rom. i. 26, 27. These instances serve as models for the current use of the words "native" and "natural," in regard to physical things.

Two or three other instances of similar usage occur in the English version, but have no warrant for the words "nature" and "natural" in the Greek. "The tongue," we are told in Jas. iii. 6, "defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature, and is set on fire of hell." But the word translated "nature"[1] there signifies, in every such connexion, "a generation" or "an age." The body of a Christian, we are told in 1 Cor. xv. 44, in reference to death and the resurrection, "is sown a natural body, and is raised a spiritual body." But the words translated "natural body"[2] there signify a psychical body, or a body connected with animal life, in contrast to a spiritual body, or a body connected only with spiritual being. Hence does the context go on to say, "There is a psychical body, and there is a spiritual body; howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is psychical, and afterward that which is spiritual." "If any be a hearer of the word and not a doer," we are told in Jas. i. 23, "he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass." But the word translated "natural" there is the same as that translated "nature" in Jas. iii. 6, and always signifies, in any such instances as this, "original" or "by birth;" so that the phrase translated "natural face" means literally "original

[1] γενέσεως. [2] σῶμα ψυχικόν.

Digitized by Google

face" or "face by birth." The Apostle Paul, writing to the Philippians, and telling them that he "trusted in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy shortly unto them, that he might be of good comfort when he should know their state," adds, "for I have no man like-minded who will naturally care for your state." [1] But the word translated "naturally" [2] there signifies "consanguineously," "relatedly to others as of the same race," or "in the manner of a kinsman legitimately born;" and it alludes to Timothy, not strictly as "like-minded" [3] with him, but as of "equal spirit," or of "equal soul," or as equal or close akin to him in the exalted family of regenerated men. Christ, we are told in Heb. ii. 16, "verily took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." But the word "nature" there is a supplement made by the English translators; has nothing whatever corresponding to it in the Greek. These instances, therefore, afford no warrant for speaking of nature or of natural things on any of the subjects to which they refer.

4. We notice, next, the view of nature which takes it to mean the native moral state of fallen man, in contrast to a Christianized, converted, or spiritual state. This is alike true, solemn, and most momentous. It exhibits nature in colours dark and dismal, utterly contrasted to the bright hues of what most men mean by nature. It also includes or implies some mighty doctrines, particularly those of the economy established over Adam in paradise, Adam's representation of his posterity, the consequences or results of his fall to all his descendants by ordinary generation, the counter-analogy between his representation of mankind and the representation of

[1] Phil. ii. 19, 20. [2] *γνησίως.* [3] *ἰσόψυχον.*

Digitized by Google

them by Christ, the position of every man at birth with reference to the two representations, every mere man's subjection as a descendant of Adam to the condemning sentence of the Divine law, his want of holiness, his tendency to commit sin, his destitution of power to practice righteousness, the cloudedness of his understanding when he arrives at the period of personal responsibility, the perversity of his will, the obduracy of his moral sense, the antagonism of his tastes to the requirements of God, and the legal and moral position at death of infants and of all others who "have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." We are not to discuss these doctrines here. We merely note them, to show the character and momentousness of this view of nature. It is the view of man in his legal and moral condition as the descendant of Adam. Yet it simply depicts his *native* state. It expresses what he is natively, or by birth, as an accountable being; just as the previous view expresses what he is natively, or by birth, as an animal. The two views, therefore, are strictly analogous; they agree in using the word "nature" to denote the properties or results of nativeness.

Several passages of Scripture either directly contain or distinctly imply the view of nature which takes it to mean the native state of man, in contrast to a Christianized, converted, or spiritual state; and very many others clearly teach the doctrines which that view includes. One passage says, "Ye were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh,

Digitized by Google

fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath even as others."[1] The meaning of that passage cannot be mistaken; is so clear and full and pointed, that nothing short of the most perverse ingenuity can evade its force. Another passage says, "When the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves."[2] Here, and in the context, the heathens devoid of the Mosaic revelation are compared with the Jews enjoying that revelation; they are described as, notwithstanding their want of that revelation, possessing sufficient moral light to render them fully accountable to God; they are described as possessing this light "by nature," or in their native state, simply as descendants of Adam, no doubt partly in consequence of glimmerings of the earlier revelations having come down to them, but expressly in consequence of "the work of the law written in their heart, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another;" and they and the Jews alike are pronounced responsible to God, insomuch that "as many as have sinned without law," or without the Mosaic revelation, here and often elsewhere called the law, "shall also perish without law, and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to the gospel." The comparison throughout is between the heathens without the Mosaic revelation and the Jews with that revelation; it rests all its weight on the fact, that the heathens had "by nature," or in their native state, sufficient moral illumination to involve responsi-

[1] Eph. ii. 1-3. [2] Rom. ii. 12-16.

Digitized by Google

bility ; and it, at the same time, by connexions with the preceding context, exhibits that "nature" or that native state in most appalling aspects. Read verses 18–32 of the previous chapter, and see what their "nature" did for them, how it worked, and what awful wickedness it produced.

Another passage says, "Shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who, by the letter and circumcision, dost transgress the law?"[1] Here the heathens and the Jews are again compared ; but they are compared, this time, with reference to the non-observance of the Mosaic ritual by the former and the observance of it by the latter ; and the heathen, as regards their non-observance of it, or as indicative of their legal and moral condition, are said "to be by nature," or in their native state. Another passage, addressed to Christians, and speaking of the respective positions of a man and a woman in Christian assemblies, says, "Judge in yourselves : is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered? Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him? but if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her, for her hair is given her for a covering?"[2] The Christians did not need to be instructed on this subject by the apostles. They learned it sufficiently from their constitutional feelings. Nature itself taught it to them. Hence does "natural" here mean their native state as accountable beings. Another passage in the English version says, "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God ; for they are foolishness unto him ; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."[3] The epithet designating man here is not

[1] Rom. ii. 27. [2] 1 Cor. xi. 13–15. [3] 1 Cor. ii. 14.

Digitized by Google

the correlative of the word translated "nature" in the previous passages, but is the word rendered "natural" in the account of the mortal body with animal life, as contrasted to the immortal body with spiritual life, in 1 Cor. xv. 44. The same word occurs in Jas. iii. 15, and Jude 19; is, in both of these places, translated "sensual;" is linked, in the former of them, with two other epithets translated "earthly" and "devilish;" and stands contrasted, in both, to other words descriptive of the converted or spiritual state of Christians. It, therefore, manifestly denotes the nature or the native state of man, as an accountable being, in contrast to a Christianized state; and it describes that nature as so perverse, so morally blind, so overwhelmed by sin, and so antagonistic to Divine truth, that the individual who continues in it receives not the things of the Spirit of God, and cannot know them, because they are discerned only through an agency and in a manner to which he is yet a stranger. Parallel teachings, or teachings of the same import, abound in Scripture. But as we are merely showing the sense of the word "nature," as designative of man's unconverted or unregenerated condition, and not discussing the doctrines involved in the fact of that condition, we shall do no more than name a few of the passages in which such teachings occur. These are Psa. li. 5; Psa. xiv. 2, 3; Job xv. 14; Rom. viii. 5–8; John iii. 3–8; Rom. iii. 9–19; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. iv. 22–24; Rom. vi. 6; Eph. ii. 11, 12; Gal. v. 16–24.

5. We notice, lastly, the view of nature which takes it, with addition of a distinctive epithet, to mean the renovated or spiritual state of true Christians. This view, like the two preceding, uses the word "nature" in the sense of native state or state by birth. The first of the

Digitized by Google

three contemplates man as, by birth, an animal, with physical organization and a psychical life: the second contemplates him as, by birth, an accountable being, under condemnation and devoid of holiness: the third contemplates him as, by regeneration or the new birth, a Christian, justified on the ground of Christ's substitutionary obedience, and imbued with love to God by the Holy Spirit. Only one passage of Scripture directly contains it; but that one is decisive: "His Divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him that hath called us to glory and virtue; whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises, that by these ye might be partakers of the Divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust."[1] The persons here are Christians; they are men who "have obtained like precious faith with the apostles through the righteousness of God and our Saviour," or, as the rendering ought to be, through the righteousness of our God and Saviour, "Jesus Christ;" they passed from a previous state to their present one—were "called" to every excellence they either possess or expect—"escaped" domineering depravity of their former condition; they acquired all the constituences of their new state, all the things of its life and godliness, by gift of God's power, through knowledge of Him, conveying to them exceeding great and precious good—announcements or provided blessings;[2] and they therefore became what they now are, "partakers of a Divine nature." What this new nature is, how it originated, how it is maintained, and how it manifests itself, are farther explained, and made very clear, in other passages. "If any man be in Christ

[1] 2 Pet. i. 3, 4. [2] ἐπαγγέλματα.

Digitized by Google

he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new."[1] "Of his own will begat He us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures."[2] "Ye have been born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever."[3] "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."[4] "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."[5] "Put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."[6] "Ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him."[7] "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."[8] A new moral condition, given gratuitously by God, on the ground of the Saviour's work, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, through our belief of the gospel—a condition so entirely new, that the transition to it from the previous one is described as a new birth, as a new creation, as a passing from death unto life, as a raising from death in sins to life in Christ[9]—this, then, is the new nature, the spiritual nature, the Divine nature of Christians.

[1] 2 Cor. v. 17. [2] James i. 18. [3] 1 Pet. i. 23.
[4] John i. 12, 13. [5] John iii. 6. [6] Eph. iv. 22–24.
[7] Col. iii. 9, 10. [8] 1 John iii. 9. [9] John v. 24; Eph. ii. 5.

Digitized by Google

Recal, now, all we have said about nature. We began by observing the numerous and confused uses of the word; we went on to detect and expose the erroneous uses of it; and we have ended by defining and explaining the correct uses. If you concur in our conclusions, you can see nature intelligently or truly, in only three aspects or of only three kinds—original, fallen, and renovated. You see original nature in the constitution of minerals, plants, and animals, as they were made by God; you see fallen nature in the guilty and depraved state of men, as descendants of apostate Adam; and you see renovated nature in the spiritual condition of Christians, as "washed and sanctified and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God," "saved by grace through faith," "the workmanship of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God had before ordained that they should walk in them."[1] You may study the first; you must deplore the second; you have intense interest in the third. Renovated nature, or the elevation of "natural men" to the possession of it, is the end or object of Messiah's reign. It is the designed result of all the arrangements and bearings of the Divine government of our world. It is that for which the Son of God became incarnate, was made under the law, obeyed, suffered, died, rose from the dead, and, in His relations to our world, wields all power in heaven and in earth."[2] The spiritual nature of true Christians, therefore, comprehends all the significance of a correct study of our entire world and of all its constituences. Original nature, in mineral, plant, and animal, is all put under Christ's feet for subordination of it to the grand end of the new

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 11; Eph. ii. 8–10.
[2] Gal. iv. 4; Rom. iv. 25; Eph. i. 18–23; Heb. i. 1–14.

Digitized by Google

nature in man.[1] Fallen nature also, in the persons and communities of ungodly men, and as to both the physical evils and the moral hostilities accruing from it, is restrained and controlled by Him toward both the raising of many of the fallen to the spiritual life and the further elevation of the spiritually alive.[2] Even the forces of other worlds, be these forces what they may, in so far as they have any connexion with our world, are completely under Him for the uses of His church, or for the producing or the invigorating of the renovated nature.[3] Hence, expatiate as you may on our earth and its heavens, on land and sea and sky, on things inanimate and things animate, on the irrational and the rational, on men and angels, if you expatiate aright, you will concentrate your thought on the new nature in redeemed men, and on the wondrous scheme of Divine mercy for creating and maturing it.

[1] Psa. viii. 5–9; Heb. ii. 6–9; Rom. viii 28.
[2] Psa. cx. 1–7; ii. 1–12; 1 Cor. xv. 25–27.
[3] Eph. i. 18–23; 1 Pet. iii. 21, 22; Rom. viii. 35–39.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER II.

THE SUPERNATURAL.

Meanings of the word Supernatural. Nine wrong uses of the word. Use of it in the sense of contrary to natural laws. Explanation of these laws, as forces. Control over the forces. How the forces are invariable and permanent. Adjustment or combination of forces. Relation of forces to special creations, to special providence, to miracles, to moral miracles, and to revelation.

THE word "supernatural," in the current uses of it, is about as various and indefinite as the word "nature." It ought, of course, to mean always that which is above nature; but it is so used in only the two instances in which nature is taken in the senses of matter and laws; and even in these instances it is used in a shifting and ill-defined manner. Try to use it in the sense of that which is above nature, in any other instances than these two, and you will find yourself alone. All the other current meanings of it stand wide away from any reference to any use of the word "nature," either wrong or right; and are utterly indefensible on any grounds of either grammar, logic, or common sense. Yet no word, in these days, requires more than it does to be both correct and clear; for no word is now employed more frequently or sharply in attacks upon the Bible and upon

Digitized by Google

Bible truth. The one drift of many persons who employ it is, first, to assume revelation and some leading facts and teachings of the Bible to be supernatural, and then to denounce everything supernatural as foolish, unreasonable, or impossible. Some popular employments of the word, indeed, have no such drift, and are merely aimless or stupid; but other employments of it, plentiful and various, in the speeches and writings of several classes of educated men, inclusive of numerous critics, philosophers, and savants, are expressly directed against most important religious truths—in some cases, from the fact or the possibility of revelation even up to the fact of the existence of God. All current notions of the supernatural, therefore, require to be examined; and, if looked at one by one, they will all be found wrong.

One use of the word "supernatural" is in the sense of unusually great or unusually strong. This use of it is merely a popular or conventional one. It occurs in speaking of unusually great athletic feats or valorous achievements, such as the acts of Samson, or the victory at Thermopylæ, as supernatural. It is simply either a hyperbole or a verbal impropriety. And it serves no other purpose, in connexion with thought, than to assist in making confusion.

Another use of the word "supernatural" is in the sense of high degree or unusual accompaniments of ordinary physical phenomena. This use of it is sometime a merely popular or conventional one, but sometimes also a product of ignorance or superstition. It occurs in speaking of extraordinary appearances in the atmosphere, such as of mountain-tops arching over to one another, of ships or towns in the air, or of groups of men marching in the clouds, as supernatural. It is

Digitized by Google

merely conventional on the part of persons who know these appearances to be produced by unusual reflexions, refractions, or transmissions of light; but is an expression of sudden bewilderment or terror, very common in old times and not unknown still, on the part of the ignorant. And, like the preceding use of the word, it serves no other purpose, in connexion with thought, than to assist in making confusion.

Another use of the word "supernatural" is in the sense of apparitions of the dead, popularly called ghosts. This use of it is entirely superstitious; and, as such, was common in former times, but is rapidly dying out. The only bearing of it on Biblical questions relates to the case of the apparition of Samuel, recorded in 1 Sam. xxviii. 7–20. That case either was a case of imposture, as contended by Sir Thomas Browne and many other learned writers, or it was a case of miracle, as contended by Dr. Delany, Dr. Hales, and some other distinguished theologians. If it was a case of imposture, no more needs be said about it; and if it was a case of miracle, it comes under the principles which we have to state in our chapter on Miracles.

Another use of the word "supernatural" is in the sense of witchcraft, or of power obtained from the devil. This use of it, no doubt, existed and even abounded among Christians of some former ages; but it arose altogether from perverted thought and superstitious feeling; and it cannot be legitimately quoted against the Bible, or against believers in the Bible, any more than any other exploded error of badly enlightened times. The term "witchcraft" itself, indeed, with its correlative "witch," occurs in the English version of the Scriptures; but, understood in any such meaning as that

Digitized by Google

now attached to it, is a gross mis-translation. The Hebrew and Greek words which it represents signify some kind or other of the superstitious practices common among the heathen for trying to discover future events; and are employed expressly to denounce these practices as sinful.

Another use of the word "supernatural" is in the sense of intelligible communication with the spirits of the dead, or of what is called spiritualism. But neither can this use of it, with any fairness, be turned against the Bible, or against believers in the Bible. Spiritualism, or the thing so called, seems to be partly a cheat, and partly a result of forces well known to science; and in neither view has it anything to do with Biblical discussion. If any advocates of it imagine it to be religious reality, and are Christian men, they alone are responsible for inferences drawn from what they are pleased to say. Other Christians have no concern whatever with spiritualism, be it designated or described or reasoned about how it may.

Another use of the word "supernatural" is in the sense of superhuman strength or superhuman contrivance. This use of it assumes man to be a paramount power, and calls everything supernatural which he cannot do; and it is, at best, both stupid and foolish. Some things which man could do formerly, such as the seemingly paltry things of making certain kinds of cements, and building certain kinds of masonry, and effecting certain niceties of stone-carving, he cannot do now; and many things which man can do now, such as steam-loom weaving, locomotive travelling, electric telegraphing, and hundreds of feats in chemistry, he could not do in former times. All the grandest physical things also which

Digitized by Google

affect his well-being, such as the movements of the winds, the revolutions of the seasons, the play of atmospheric electricity, the action of volcano and earthquake, always have been, are now, and always will be immensely beyond his control. A superhuman thing is no more against the Bible than the sun or the moon is against the Bible. Or if any perverse inference could be drawn from superhuman things against Bible truths, it would be drawn likewise against what the drawer of it calls "natural laws."

Another use of the word "supernatural" is in the sense of anything above reason. But the phrase "above reason" here is worse defined, or more loosely used, than even the word "supernatural." The use of it very often, or even generally, on the lips or in the writings of strong opponents of the Bible, is sheer mystification. You must give it definiteness, in order to give it point; and if you do, you will make it mean either what is undiscoverable by human reason, what is incomprehensible by the human mind, or what seems either a contradiction within itself or a contradiction to some known truth. Now brand any of these as what you call supernatural, and as therefore to be rejected, and you brand and reject the very bases of science. First, there are many things in science, in almost all its departments, things of the character of postulates or data, things essential to the existence of all its superstructure, which never have been discovered by human reason, and to every appearance never will. Must therefore these be condemned as false? Farewell then to all science! Again, there are many things in even elementary science, things open to the cognition of every ordinary observer, such things as light, heat, electricity, gravitation, life,

Digitized by Google

mind, self-consciousness, which are well known as to their properties, but which themselves ever have been, are now, and probably ever will be incomprehensible by the human mind. Must these also be therefore condemned as false? Farewell then to all knowledge! Again, some things in the sciences, such as the paradoxes in physics, the isometricisms in chemistry, and the instances of an innocuous substance becoming two poisons, or of two poisons becoming an innocuous substance, which appear to be both contradictions within themselves and contradictions to well-ascertained truths, and yet are proved facts. Must these likewise be therefore condemned as false? Farewell then even to demonstrated truth! Many things in the Bible also, no doubt, are such as never could have been discovered by human reason; many there are loftier and grander far than the utmost limits of human comprehension; a few there present an aspect perplexing to an infidel, or may seem to him inharmonious with their surroundings, and really are irreconcilable with his own preconceived beliefs; nay, all the chief things there, all those things which have been the Divine means of vitalizing, renovating, and enlightening all the men who have believed them, cannot be received or known at all either by infidels or by any other "natural men," so long as they cling to their "natural state," [1] and yet all things whatever in the Bible are at once gloriously luminous in themselves, gloriously luminous as one consistent whole, and gloriously consistent with all other truth. The only genuine "reason" is to see and love them, for then the "natural" reason is purified from both error and perversity; and the only real un-reason is to be blind to

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 14.

Digitized by Google

their light, and to reject their teachings. Would you wish to see an actual instance of manifest un-reason? Look at the judgment which pronounces revelation to be above reason, and as therefore to be rejected; and you will see it there. What is *above* reason cannot be *known* to reason; so that any judgment respecting it, and most of all a judgment unfavourable to it, is of the very essence of un-reason.

Another use of the word "supernatural" is in the sense of anything above matter or above materialism. This use of it is made by persons who represent mere matter to be nature, or nature to be mere matter; and it has, in their hands, the novel recommendation of being grammatical or consistent; but it has no other. It regards nature and all existing things as convertible terms; and of course, finds no place for anything above nature, or beside it. But then the nature of which it speaks is mere matter; and the real question comes to be: Is there anything beside or above *mere matter?* We argued that question in the chapter on Nature, and do not need to argue it again. Life is above mere matter; mind is above it; intellect is above it; brutes, as possessing life and mind, are above it. Do they therefore not exist? But how do we know them to be above mere matter? By manifestations of a kind which it cannot make; by exhibition of such forces as it cannot possess; and by such results of these forces as it cannot produce. Contemplate, then, the glorious manifestations of infinitely higher forces—of infinite power, knowledge, wisdom, and beneficence—in creation, and in revelation; and see there the presence of "the eternal Godhead."

Another use of the word "supernatural" is in the sense of nature. To say that this is a use of it may look

Digitized by Google

like fiction. How could the supernatural, with any possibility of meaning, have ever been called nature? or nature called supernatural? Yet the thing has been done, not simply in an implied or inferential way, but in the express words, "Science can take no note of the supernatural, unless it becomes natural, and takes the oath of allegiance to nature. Nature itself is too supernatural to require any additions from the realms of human ignorance." What these words, or any words similar to them, may be intended exactly to mean, we can only conjecture. They certainly mean nothing in themselves; they are absolute nonsense, as read grammatically; and they appear, at best, to be a specimen of the vague grandiloquence with which many rhetorical flourishes, in the name of science, are made against the truths of the Bible. Their intended meaning, though quite "in the clouds," may perhaps be the same as the next and last we have to mention.

The last use of the word "supernatural" we have to notice, is in the sense of anything contrary to the laws of nature. This is the main use of it against the Bible and against Bible truths. This opens the chief battle-ground on the subject of the supernatural. Here is the grand field of combat between the opponents and the advocates of at once special creation, providence, miracles, and revelation. Yet the terms employed, the very watch-words of battle, are as indefinite and loose as ever. The word "supernatural" here, indeed, comes out constructively to mean special creation, providence, miracles, and revelation; but the phrase "laws of nature" lies almost as loose as a bundle of straw, to be twisted any way, or driven hither and thither by any wind that may blow. No man can hope for a fair fight, for anything

Digitized by Google

better than a *mêlée*, till the terms are rigidly defined. What, then, are the laws of nature? What is nature? and what are its laws?

Nature is taken to mean either matter or God.[1] The laws of nature, therefore, must be taken to mean either the laws of matter or the laws of God. But men who talk of laws of matter talk a language which no other men can understand; or, rather, they employ well-known words in a manner so peculiar to themselves, and so exceedingly different from every recognized manner of employing them, as to drive all meaning out of them, and convert them into nonsense. What should we say of the phrase, "the performances of a nonentity"? Could we draw any meaning out of that? or could any men drag any meaning into it? What better is the phrase, "the laws of matter"? Understand laws as you may, take them in any of the numerous senses in which they have ever been understood; and you find none of them in matter, as matter—none of them in matter viewed apart from God. Matter is contemplated by the persons in question as the sum of all existence; as at once the cause, the effect, and the substance of all existing things; as neither having existed at first, nor existing now, in virtue of any intelligence. Now where no intelligence is, how can there be any laws? Matter, viewed in that way, can neither give laws nor possess them. To talk of "laws of matter" in that way is no better than to talk of the doings of a negation. We, therefore, have done at once with all persons who make the laws of nature to denote the laws of mere matter. Biblicists can have no argument with them, nor can they have any argument with Biblicists. All their discussions about

[1] *Cf.* Chap. I.

Digitized by Google

the supernatural amount to nothing more than a blank, meaningless, unreasoning declaration of sheer materialism. No intelligence is taken into connexion with it, and no intelligible thing can be said about it.

We turn, then, for explanation of terms, entirely to those who take the laws of nature to mean the laws of God. How do they define the laws? We would quote a full definition from some of their foremost writers, if we could find one; but as we cannot find a tolerably comprehensive one, or even an approach to that, we shall compile one, with studied regard to fairness, from the aggregate scope of their statements and reasonings. We may not so frame it that it shall agree, in all respects, with the representations of each one of several of their distinguished writers; yet we have confidence of so framing it that it shall be acknowledged as, on the whole, a fair summary of their views as a body. "The laws of nature," then, as they understand them, are nothing nominal or abstract; nothing of the character of mere sequence of one thing to another; nothing arbitrary or capricious; nothing scattered, local, or temporary; nothing inert, inoperative, or feeble; nothing fitful, variable, or resistible; nothing hurtful, non-beneficent, or without comprehensive design; nothing, in any degree, incompetent to the creational development and the constant government of the world; nothing simply or solely material, or confined only to physical things. "The laws of nature," on the contrary, are thorough realities; they work as causes, or produce effects; they are necessarily true, all absolute, all essential; they operate universally, uniformly, and permanently; they are never dormant, but always active and ever strong; they never go into abeyance, and can never be thwarted

Digitized by Google

and never turned aside; they work always benignly, always conducively to good, always with results perfectly excellent and most wonderfully admirable; they have formed and maintained the world, in all its constituences, mineral, vegetable, and animal, and in all the millions of reciprocities among these, and in all the millions of intricacies among the reciprocities, alike as to things now extinct as to things still extant, all onward and upward from the world's embryonic condition; and they comprehend within their sphere, and either maintain, govern, or control by their sway, not only all things physical, but also life, mind, intellect, and all things moral. That is a long definition; but not too long; scarcely long enough. Read it again. What is the real import of it? Are not these "laws" just the workings of God himself?

But to view them in that way is to concede toward the supernatural. The advocates of "the laws," as opposed to the supernatural, therefore, understand them to mean *forces*. What then is a force? How do we get our notion of it? How can any notion of it be got? You may look long enough at even the grandest phenomena of the physical world, and get no notion of force thence. You may observe hundreds of times the concurrence of a flash of lightning, a peal of thunder, and a crash in tree or masonry—men observed it from the earliest period till recent times—without obtaining from it the slightest notion of the force of electricity. You may observe incessantly, as long as you please, the fall of bodies to the ground, the waxing and the waning of the moon, the rising and the setting of the sun, and the succession of the seasons—men observed them from the earliest time till the time of Newton—without obtaining

Digitized by Google

from them the slightest notion of the force of gravitation. You may also look long enough at any movements of brutes or of men, and get no notion of force thence. You may observe hundreds of times a horse drawing a vehicle, without obtaining the slightest notion of the vital force which effects the draught; or may observe hundreds of times the drill-exercises of a military corps, without obtaining the slightest notion of either the moral force within or the moral force without, the volition of the men and the command of the officer, which effect the movements. How then is the notion of force acquired? Entirely from within; entirely from the conscious existence, the conscious exercise, and the observed effect of a man's own will. The will is a motive power. Every man feels his own will to be a motive power; every man employs it as such; and every man observes the effects which it produces. A man wills to stretch out his arm, to open his hand, to move or press or strike an object, say an egg-shell; and he sees an effect produced. He then and there gets his notion of force; he recognizes that the producing of an effect, or the producing of motion, fracture, or any other change in an object, is due to force; and he henceforth, whenever observing any changes in things exterior to him and independent of him, infers or knows that each one of the changes results from some force. Few men or none may be conscious or recollective of having made this analysis for themselves, just as none have recollection of their earliest acts of consciousness or perception of any kind; but all men who reflect on the sources or origin of their knowledge, just as infallibly trace up their notion of force to the exercise of the will through the organization of the arm, as they infallibly trace up their notion

Digitized by Google

of light or of colours to the exercise of perception through the organization of the eye. Here, then, is the essence, or rather the entirety, of our knowledge of force. We know force to be identical with will. Say, therefore, that what you call "the laws of nature" are forces, you simply identify them with will; and as these forces are true, absolute, universal, uniform, permanent, ever active, ever strong, ever irresistible, always benign, always manifested in perfectly excellent and most admirable results —as they have formed and maintained the world, in all its constituences, and in all the millions of reciprocities among these, ever onward and upward from the world's embryonic condition—as they comprehend within their sphere, and either maintain, govern, or control by their sway, not only all things physical, but also life, mind, intellect, and all things moral—what can the will be which they represent but the will of God? what can they be themselves but simply and entirely the expression or the working of the omnipotent, omnipresent, all-wise, all-beneficent will of the Infinite One? You thus rise from the very notion of force, through your own consciousness, and through observation of all phenomena within your view, to the recognition of the omnipresent Deity. You are winged in your flight, too, from its start throughout, by axiomatic, inborn, invincible cognition of God's existence. No man is without that cognition; and any man who struggles to smother it within himself, or to argue it out of himself, will find it so undying and so resistive that he can eventually do no more than attempt to change its utterance into the notion of a force —a universal, creative, world-maintaining, all-wise force —which, disguise it as he may, even under forms of mere matter, amounts simply to the expression or the working

Digitized by Google

of the will of Infinite Intelligence. Better for all expounders of forces, better for at once the directness, the clearness, and the consistency of their expositions, whatever kind of theory they hold, whether low or high, to accept at once the teachings of revelation. "God worketh all things after the counsel of His own will."[1] "He made the world, and upholds all things by the word of His power."[2] "He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay His hand, or say unto Him, What doest Thou?"[3] "The kingdom is the Lord's; and He is the governor among the nations."[4] He is "the judge of all the earth."[5] "It is God who worketh in you"—in Christians who are "working out their own salvation"—"both to will and to do of His good pleasure."[6]

But the advocates of the laws of nature, in the sense of the laws of God, say that they acknowledge "the forces" to have been created by God, but that they regard them as *in* objects, and as therefore apart from God. *In* objects! How can that make any difference? The Bible, speaking of the highest of all created objects on earth, Christian men and women, says: "The God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."[7] The Most High is eminently in Christians, because He is "the Saviour or the preserver of all men specially of those that believe;"[8] but he is also, according to the several kinds or degrees of their condition, in all His other creatures. He is omnipresent, and therefore in all space and in all objects. His creating worlds,

[1] Eph. i. 11. [2] Heb. i. 2, 3. [3] Dan. iv. 35.
[4] Psa. xxii. 28. [5] Gen. xviii. 25. [6] Phil. ii. 12, 13.
[7] Eph. iv. 6. [8] 1 Tim. iv. 10.

Digitized by Google

and the constituences of worlds, to occupy portions of space, did not exclude Him from these portions of space. He is not to be thought of according to the notion of matter, any two particles of which cannot lie in the same point of space in the same instant of time; but He is to be thought of according to the notion of His own infinitude, as God who is a Spirit, and who is everywhere, and always everywhere.[1]

But let us look at the question, of a force within a thing, from a very low point upward. Here is a watch; a force is inside of it; and that force keeps it going. The man who made it put the force into it; and, when he had completed the making of it, he may be supposed to have ceased from all care about it, or to have consigned it entirely to the working of its contained force. But he really did not cease to care about it; nor even when he passed it into my possession, did he cease to have concern with it; for he stood guarantee that it should work, and he still has superintendence over it in so far as its condition admits of superintendence. That superintendence, indeed, is very small; but it is very small mainly in consequence of the force superintended being single and isolated; and it would have required to be great and close and constant, either if the moving forces had been numerous, complicated, and conflicting, or even if the single force had been such as to be maintained, checked, controlled, or liable to revulsion by the constant play and cross-play of numerous other forces. Suppose vapour actions, liquid actions, corroding actions, abrading actions, impulsions through long wires, contortions through long mimic chains, and many actions of other kinds, from near and from afar, all working in connexion

[1] John iv. 24; Psa. cxxxix. 1–16.

Digitized by Google

with hundreds of other things, but all known and understood through vast comprehension by the watchmaker—suppose all these playing constantly on the force within the watch, and all requiring to be kept in perfect mutual adjustment in order to the keeping of the watch-force at work, would not then the watchmaker's superintendence have been rendered at once comprehensive, constant, and minute? That is an unutterably poor and paltry emblem of the play of multitudinous forces connectedly with any one single force in any one object in the world; and, in so far as it represents the watchmaker as *among* the forces affecting his watch, it is no emblem at all—nor can any emblem whatever be formed—of the Divine presence "in and through" all creatures. Is therefore the case we have supposed without point? The watchmaker is a power; he is an intelligent power; he is not only a moving power, but a making one; and what he makes he superintends. There is the point. The watchmaker's position, in the way in which we have figured it, is an illustration, though a very faint one, of the doctrine of providence.

Take another illustration. There goes a locomotive. A single force moves it; and that force, the elasticity of steam, as to the supplying and the regulating of it, is superintended by several persons. Another force, heat, produces the steam by evaporating water; and that force, as to the maintaining of it, is superintended by the stoker. A group of forces, in the combustion of coal, evolves the heat; and these also are kept in play, and regulated, by the stoker's superintendence. A succession and a concentration of many forces, of very various kinds, are concerned with the supply of the coal; and these are done, with aid of vital forces, and under various

Digitized by Google

superintendence, on the part of many persons. A great aggregate of forces, combined into machinery, is kept in play by the steam; is under the habitual superintendence of a functionary appointed to take care of it; and resulted from a succession and a concentration of other forces, more numerous, more various, and under more superintendences, than are those which are concerned with the supply of the coal. Another force, the force of friction, is constantly at work to retard the action of the locomotive's wheels; and, with a view to the reduction of it to a minimum, is under the habitual superintendence of the overseer of the railway. Other forces of retardation arise within the machinery, and are restrained to a minimum under other superintendence. Another force, the force of momentum, comes into play during all descents down inclined planes; and is held in check, or regulated, under superintendence of the driver or the guard. Many other forces, pneumatic, hydraulic, dynamic, atmospheric, chemical, and of other kinds, also are more or less at work; and only for their being beyond man's power of mastery and manipulation, or if they could be brought under that power, would likewise be kept under official superintendence. See here, then, a single force within an object—the force of steam within a locomotive; see how very many forces are at work along with it, variously concurring, co-operating, thwarting, retarding, or accelerating; see how some might bring it to a stand, or others propel it into mischief; and see, above all, how everything about itself and them is under searching superintendence. Yet this is an exceedingly dim and defective analogue of any single force within any object as existing among the works of God. And even were we to select one of the

Digitized by Google

highest instances, or any number of the highest instances, of human superintendence of a human work, we should find these also most paltry emblems of the Divine providence.

These illustrations lead us up to the consideration of the forces as invariable and permanent. This is a consideration of high importance; and it has been so conducted by the advocates of "the laws of nature" as to constitute the weightiest part of the discussion. They represent the forces as, in every view or in all respects, invariable and permanent. They speak of them as though they always ran in parallel lines, or worked in parallel grooves; as though they always existed only singly, or at most in constant groups; as though they never crossed one another, never modified one another, never interfered with one another's workings; as though no two or more of them ever came into new adjustments, ever combined to produce new effects, ever acted conjointly to bring out results which could not have accrued from them separately; as though all the vast multitude of forces, or any number of them whatever, in all their numberless diversities of character, in any conceivable juncture, just in the same way as any single one of them or as any one small constant group of them, have always been invariable and permanent. The advocates of "the laws of nature," indeed, seldom if ever put this representation in the full form in which we have here put it; but they always talk and reason as if it had been fully put. They make no distinction between forces acting singly or in constant groups, and forces acting in any wider field. They do not recognize the idea of any new adjustment of forces, or of any new combination of them, with production of any new effects. They do not see,

Digitized by Google

or do not practically admit, that forces may retain their invariableness and their permanency singly, and yet may go into such adjustments or combinations with one another as may elicit effects considerably or even entirely different from any which could have resulted from them separately. They point to the uniform revolution of the orbs through space, to the uniform succession of our world's seasons, to the uniform results of aggregate operations in our world's cosmical history, to the uniform phenomena of organization and physiology in plants and animals, and to uniform workings of many kinds in all ordinary connexions between force and product; and they challenge us to accept these as evidence that "the laws of nature," in every view or in all respects, are invariable and permanent.

Now about any single force, or any constant group of forces, there is no question. About any such force as that of gravitation, or any such force as that of any compound chemical body which behaves in the manner of an elementary chemical body, there is no dispute. An appeal to the revolution of the orbs through space, or to the succession of the seasons, or to most of the operations in the earth's cosmical history, or to any or all of the ordinary phenomena of organization and physical things, is entirely out of the discussion. Even what is termed the doctrine of convertibility of forces, or conservation of energy, has no place here. That doctrine supposes one force to pass into another—supposes any one form of force to run round the circle of other or all forms of force—supposes forces of every kind to be only forms or manifestations of some one central force issuing from one fountain-head of power; but it is a mere theory, a mere generalization of ideas, a mere abstraction

Digitized by Google

or mere representative thought, not much different from the idea of a genus as containing all species ; or it is, at best, no more than a comprehensive way of saying that all the forces in the world form one grand aggregate, which never suffers any loss or diminution ; and whether true or not, it has no practical bearing on the present question, and indeed no practical bearing of any kind whatever. What alone we have to consider here is the adjustment or combination of forces ; whether this takes place in a way to distinguish it from mere concurrence or co-operation of forces ; whether it takes place with production of effects different from any which could have resulted from its forces separately, or from its forces only concurrently ; whether, above all, it takes place in any such way or with any such effects as lead the mind logically upward to the recognition of special creation, special providence, miracles, and revelation. This alone is the question, as regards the invariability and permanence of forces ; and this therefore demands attention, apart from all other considerations.

But as regards relation to belief in special providence, and even in other forms of what the advocates of "natural law" call the supernatural, we have first some remarks to make respecting single forces or constant groups of forces. Man is only a creature, possessing only derived or dependent forces ; yet he is a power, and he sometimes uses his forces at will to produce unusual effects. Has he any control over the air to raise a wind ? Not much certainly ; yet he has enough to be discernible ; and he actually uses it. He raises a *small wind, in a small way*, whenever he pleases. Why should it be thought strange, why rather should it not be readily believed, that God, the giver of all the power which man

Digitized by Google

has, wields the same control, and wields it unlimitedly, universally, and always? Why not believe at once that "He hath gathered the wind in His fists"? that "He bringeth the wind out of His treasuries"? that "He causeth His wind to blow"? that "He createth the wind"?[1] Man, it may be said, uses forces, in the form of implements or machinery, such as fan, bellows, or winnowing-machine, for raising any small wind which he can raise. But if so, he is only proved thereby to have control over these forces also; and as to God, if intermediate forces must be thought of, are not all the highest forces for raising wind, such as heat and electricity and all the forces in the world, under His command? Hence we read, in what is reckoned one of the supernatural narratives of the Bible, "God made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters were assuaged."[2] Hence do we read also, in the narrative of what is commonly regarded as a miracle, "The Lord brought an east wind upon the land of Egypt all that day and all that night; and when it was morning, the east wind brought the locusts;" and afterwards, "The Lord turned a mighty strong west wind which took away the locusts, and cast them into the Red Sea."[3] A man can, at will, blow in or blow out a considerable amount of small light objects by means of a small wind of his own raising and maintaining; and why not believe, promptly and as a matter of course, that God could and did, at His own will, blow the locusts into Egypt and afterwards blow them out of it, by special winds of His own sending? Again we read, in the account of a very remarkable miracle—not only a remarkable one in ordinary estima-

[1] Prov. xxx. 4; Psa. cxxxv. 7; Jer. x. 13; Psa. cxlvii. 18; Amos. iv. 13.
[2] Gen. viii. 1. [3] Exod x. 13, 19.

Digitized by Google

tion, but remarkable as being specially referred to or pointedly noted in about twelve other passages of Scripture—"The Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided." [1] The piece of sea here was a tongue of water, very similar to that in the head of a contracting estuary, with the important difference that no river was flowing into it; and, as can be readily understood by every observer of estuarial waters, it would yield to the impact of strong, steady, constant, long-continued wind. And the fact that the wind was special, or was raised and maintained by the Divine will, is no more than the analogue of the fact that a small special wind can be raised and maintained by a man at will. Again we read, in a comprehensive account of another miracle, for supplying the Israelites with flesh in the wilderness, that God "brought quails," and that "the quails came up and covered the camp;" [2] but we read further, as to the manner of the miracle, that "there went forth a wind from the Lord, and brought quails from the sea, and let them fall by the camp." [3] Any person who has read of the prodigious flocks of wild pigeons in North America, so densely ranged together in their flight and so many square miles in area that they pass through the air like a vast black cloud and throw an obscuring shadow on the ground beneath them, as they sweep onward before the breeze, will readily comprehend both the manner of the quails' coming, and how they were numerous enough to be meat to so great a multitude as the Israelites; nor will he have the slightest demur to accept the statement

[1] Exod. xiv. 21. [2] Psa. cv. 40; Exod. xvi. 13.
[3] Num. xi. 31.

Digitized by Google

which follows, that they fell "as it were a day's journey on this side, and as it were a day's journey on the other side, round about the camp, and as it were two cubits high upon the face of the earth." The main point in the miracle is that it was done by means of "a wind from the Lord;" and that, once more, is only an analogue to the fact, that man has the power of raising and maintaining a small wind at his pleasure.

Let us take another example illustrative of control over single forces or over constant groups of forces. Man has the power of collecting and discharging, at will, small quantities of electricity. Savants know abundantly that he has this power; they know that he often uses it; they know that he has used it so extensively and variously as to have fashioned the use of it, in the collecting, discharging, or applying of electricity, into both a science and a series of arts; they know also that some of themselves have used it, through control of the electric force, for splitting asunder some forces which had never before been known to exist separately, and for effecting new adjustments or new combinations of forces with entirely new results. Well, since man has the power of collecting and discharging, at will, small quantities of electricity, and since he uses that power freely and wonderfully, how can we refrain from believing that God retains in His own hand an infinitely higher power of collecting, discharging, and applying large quantities of electricity at His own will, or that He uses that power with a breadth, a diversity, a wisdom, and a beneficence of effects infinitely greater than the broadest and the best of man's? Contemplate the electrician's laboratory; observe the remarkable control which is exercised over the electric fluid there; notice the numerous

Digitized by Google

purposes to which the electric force is bent there; follow the long and diversified series of results which are achieved by the electrician's management of electric action there; or if you have no opportunity of observing these things actually, read about them in books; and then say whether you can hesitate for an instant to believe that God, who made both the electricity and the electrician, retains and uses His own inconceivably greater power of working inconceivably greater electric wonders. An electrician who should first exhibit the isolated electric feats in his laboratory, and ask us to admire them as *his*, and then allude to the universal electric phenomena in earth and sea and sky, and tell us that God has nothing to do with them, would almost seem to intimate that awful impersonation of evil "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped." [1] The wonders which he performs, too, though genuine in themselves, would, through association of the teaching with them, become "lying wonders." [2] How vastly better is it, and how entirely logical, to accept promptly, fully, and devoutly the statements of the Bible: "The Lord maketh lightnings for the rain." [3] "He made a way for the lightning of the thunder." [4] "He directeth His lightning unto the ends of the earth; He thundereth with the voice of His excellency; He thundereth marvellously with His voice." [5] "His lightnings enlightened the world; the earth saw and trembled." [6] "The voice of the Lord is upon the waters; the God of glory thundereth; the voice of the Lord divideth the flames of fire; the voice

[1] 2 Thess. ii. 4.
[2] 2 Thess. ii. 9.
[3] Psa. cxxxv. 7.
[4] Job xxviii. 26, and xxxviii. 25.
[5] Job xxxvii. 3-5.
[6] Psa. xcvii. 4.

Digitized by Google

of the Lord shaketh the wilderness; the Lord sitteth upon the flood; yea, the Lord sitteth King for ever." [1] And then, as to a case of special providence, a case which is often regarded as one of miracle, the case of one of the arousing inflictions upon the Egyptians, leading to the Divine deliverance of the Israelites, "The Lord sent thunder and hail, and the fire ran along upon the ground; and the Lord rained hail upon the land of Egypt; so there was hail, and fire mingled with the hail, very grievous, such as there was none like it in all the land of Egypt since it became a nation." [2]

Thus, then, even single forces or constant groups of forces, in their operations in the world, exist under certain limitations which admit of special providence and of miracles. They are invariable and permanent in their own character or in their mode of working; but they can yield to a controlling power of volition, directing them to a special purpose. Man has controlling power over them to a small extent; and much more has God controlling power over them without limit. But has not man also power over some single forces to disengage them from an original or native condition of union with other forces, and to set them free to work separately, with the producing of effects which never resulted from them in their original condition? Such a power as that would show them to exist under limitations admitting of special providence and miracle, even more strikingly than the power of controlling them, when natively free, to a particular purpose. Now man does possess such a power, and he has actually used it. His possession and his use of it, indeed, have been shown chiefly in connexion with chemical manipulations; and, perhaps,

[1] Psa. xxix. 3–10. [2] Exod. ix. 23, 24.

Digitized by Google

they may therefore be represented as only a power and a use relating to the single force of chemical affinity. But chemical affinity is not a single force, nor even one of many forces. To talk of chemical affinity in reference to all the forces which are at work in chemical action, is nearly the same as to talk of convertibility of forces, or of conservation of energy, in reference to all the forces which are at work in the world. The phrase is simply a generalized one, to denote the aggregate of chemical forces. These are all distinct from one another, all specific, with characters of marked difference, many of them not only different but contrasted; and they count by the thousand. Some of them also, as single forces, are natively free or separate; and others, as single forces, are natively combined with other forces. Now man has wielded a power to disengage some of the combined ones from their state of combination, and to retain and apply them, in their new or separated state, with the producing of effects entirely new and very striking.

Look at the metals sodium and potassium. These are elementary substances or single forces; they act in the manner of intense affinity for oxygen; they act so constantly in that manner as always to be found natively in combination with oxygen; they constitute along with it soda and potash, of quiet aspect, with alkaline action; they never existed separately, in even the smallest quantity, till some specimens of them were set free by means of the electric force, in the laboratory of Sir Humphrey Davy; and they were found then, and of course have been found ever since, to exercise so curiously their peculiar actions that, when laid upon water, they violently take the oxygen out of it, the one with a fierce splutter and a hissing noise, the other with a blazing

Digitized by Google

violet-red flame. In fact, they burn water, insomuch that, if you had enough of them, they would burn a large lake, and convert its bed into dry land ; and, at the same time, though true metals, they are so light as not to sink in water, but float on it, and lick it into fire. Here, at the first occurrence of it, was a phenomenon which persons of all previous times, amid their ignorance of chemical or electric action, might readily have pronounced a miracle; and here, when they found it to be not transient but permanent, was what they might readily have pronounced a special creation. Look again at chlorine, with the wondrous new effects, in bleaching processes and in striking chemical phenomena, which it has produced since man disengaged portions of it from its native state of combination with other forces ; look at phosphorus, look at iodine, look at several other elementary bodies, with the wondrous new effects, in great variety, which they have produced since man disengaged portions of them from their native state of combination with other forces ; and you have again and many times over, in these new effects, what men in previous times might readily have pronounced miracles or special creations. The effects were as strictly new as if the forces had been new ; they were as completely beyond all the world's experience, throughout all previous time, as any miracles or special creations were; and they demonstrate that, while the single forces are invariable and permanent, they nevertheless exist under limitations which admit of special creation, providence, and miracle. Man has a power over them to bring them into new conditions of action; and he uses that power, with the result of eliciting from them entirely new effects. And can we hesitate to believe that an analogous power, to

Digitized by Google

an unlimited extent, is possessed by God or may be used by God? Electricity has been the chief means of man's wielding the power; and electricity, as we have already argued, is infinitely more at God's command than at man's. You may talk, if you like, of laboratory and apparatus; but you may see, in the whole ensphered earth, a laboratory and an apparatus which compare with those of an electrician as the heavens compare with a baby's toy; you may remember, too, that God made both the electricity and the electrician.

Let us now come to the question of adjustment or combination of forces. Are forces of all kinds capable of working only in the manner of single forces or of constant groups of forces, or at most in a merely concurrent or co-operating manner? Or can they undergo such adjustment or combination as shall produce effects different from any which could accrue from them singly, and as shall, in consideration of these effects, lead the mind logically upward to the recognition of special creation, providence, and miracle? We say that such adjustment or combination exists; that it is continually occurring; that it works operations as distinct, as conspicuous, and as deeply affecting the world's condition and vicissitudes as the operations of the single forces. We say also that man, within small limits, yet quite clearly, has power to effect it; and that, in numerous instances, he has used that power and is always using it. We might point to machines and engines; we might show how these are truly adjustments or combinations of single forces; and we might note how readily they have always been acknowledged to be new things, by their being called inventions; but, as they are often, though erroneously, maintained to be merely contri-

Digitized by Google

vances for regulating forces, and not to embody also combinations of forces, we shall not press them into our argument. But look at gunpowder. That, beyond all question, is a combination of forces; not simply a mixture of sulphur, saltpetre, and charcoal, but a combination of the forces severally within these. The first instance of it, too, was notoriously an invention, an entirely new thing in the earth. Never before had sulphur, saltpetre, and charcoal, either by themselves or in any of their previous combinations, produced any such effects as they began to produce then. Nor were these merely new effects, and very astounding ones; but they began to operate as causes—strong, diversified, extensive, with a force so great and a sway so wide as to develop a mighty influence on even the commercial, the political, and the social affairs of nations. The very affairs of war, of industry, of diplomacy, of international intercourse became suddenly changed. The very world of mankind, especially in its civilized portions, found itself in important new conditions, and assumed in some important respects a new complexion. Look again at numerous invented substances in factories and drug-shops; substances combining forces which do not natively exist together; substances well known and much valued in the useful arts and in the practice of medicine; such substances as sulphuric acid, hydrochloric acid, chloroform, sulphuric ether, and many more. These were all formed by man's manipulation; they all sprang from his putting together, or combining, previous separate forces; and they all produce effects which, at their first formation, were entirely new, and which never result from the forces separately. You might look next at hundreds of new and wonderful things

Digitized by Google

in the chemist's laboratory; things so novel and strange that the very names necessary to be given to them read like an invented language; substances formed by combinations of previously separate forces, and operations either evolving these substances themselves or showing the effects of them in ways which men of former ages would have been sure to regard as either special providences or special creations. Chemistry and knowledge of electricity, together with other physical substances, have during the last sixty years made such advances in achieving new results from the recombining of forces as have struck all reflecting men with astonishment; and should they, during the next hundred years, make proportionate advances in the same direction, they will be certain to do many things which, if proposed to be done now, would be pronounced by our best living savants either visionary or impossible.

Nor have chemists and electricians only made new and striking combinations with new and striking effects, but they have also obtained for us knowledge and proof that multitudes of native combinations, formerly unobserved or not understood, have always been producing effects of kinds analogous to those accruing from their own new combinations. Chemistry in the kitchen or in the field is the same as chemistry in the laboratory. Some of its combinations, in the one as in the other, look like annihilations, converting solid substances into imperceptible gases; others look like creations, converting imperceptible gases into liquids or powders; and multitudes look like deeds of magic, totally changing consistences, forms, colours, odours, sapidities, and all other classes of observable properties. Hundreds of these magnificent changes go on in the common processes

Digitized by Google

of kitchens and factories, and fail to be universally striking solely on account of being universally familiar; and millions, quite as beautiful as any in the laboratory, and generally far more complex, yet commonly slow, and rather wooing the attention of the wise than provoking the astonishment of the vulgar, are constantly going on in the air, in the sea, in the soil, in plants, in animals, in all the processes of growth, activity, and decay, and in all the countless interchanges of dependence among the beings and classes and kingdoms of material things. Now, if man has control over the separate forces to make new combinations of them, with new effects, why should not God have infinitely greater control over them? If man, working among comparatively few of the native combinations, has power to make many new ones, why should not God, reigning over and through all of them, have power to make innumerable new ones? If man, who is but a creature living and moving in God, and having his being from Him, can limitedly make new combinations with new effects, why cannot God, who created both him and all the things he works with, unlimitedly make new combinations with new effects? If the chemist and the electrician now so combine forces as to exhibit new and great wonders to their contemporaries, why should not God have formerly so combined them as to show miracles to the ancients? or why should not he have always been combining them as to have shown wonders of special providence in all ages? Since you believe the comparatively poor and weak reports which say that chemists and electricians do wonders, why do you not also believe the surpassingly rich and powerful Scriptures, which say that God does great wonders? "He alone

Digitized by Google

doeth great wonders."[1] "He doeth great things past finding out; yea, and wonders without number."[2] "Who is like Him, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?"[3] He bore witness to His apostles "with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will."[4] "The heavens shall praise Thy wonders, O Lord, Thy faithfulness also in the congregation of the saints; for who in the heaven can be compared unto the Lord? who among the sons of the mighty can be likened unto the Lord? The heavens are Thine; the earth also is Thine; as for the world and the fulness thereof, Thou hast founded them. Thou hast a mighty arm; strong is Thy hand, and high is Thy right hand."[5]

Can you conceive an accomplished chemist, especially an accomplished lecturer on chemistry, to deny the power of God to re-adjust or re-combine chemical forces? Such a person may be found; and he speaks and acts somewhat thus. He begins by saying that there is nothing spontaneous in the world; he states that all forces, in all senses, are invariable and permanent; he says that no beings, either organic or inorganic, either mental or material, can act otherwise than as the forces impel them; he then proceeds to exhibit phenomena, or work experiments, illustrative of the forces; he goes on to show a freezing of water in contact with red-hot crucibles, and to elicit other effects equally wonderful, such as not only were entirely unknown in former times, but as would then have been pronounced supernatural; and he either concludes by repeating his introductory sentiment, that there is nothing spontaneous in the world,

[1] Psa. cxxxvi. 4. [2] Job ix. 10. [3] Exod. xv. 11.
[4] Heb. ii. 4. [5] Psa. lxxxix. 5-13.

Digitized by Google

or at the least assumes that sentiment to have been all along understood. But—do you see?—he has thoroughly contradicted and refuted it. He, first, in his own person, speaks and acts spontaneously; he, next, puts forth his own acquired knowledge of physical forces to show that these can be so adjusted or combined as to produce effects formerly unknown; and he then wields his own power over some of them to the actual production of effects which he expressly exhibits as formerly unknown, and which are very highly wonderful. Had he lived some centuries ago, not only would the things he does have been reckoned supernatural, but he himself would have been reckoned supernatural, and might have been judicially condemned as a wizard. His own exploits blow his own belief to atoms. He wishes you to understand that he can do nothing but what invariable and permanent forces impel him to do, and of course nothing but what they could have impelled any other man to do since the days of Adam; and he actually lets you see him doing, by means of special adjustment of some of the forces, a series of wonderful things which they never enabled and never could enable any man to do till either he or some previous chemist discovered the manner of making that special adjustment. His sentiment about himself is disproved by what he does; and much more is his sentiment about God. His experiments demonstrate him to have the power of adjusting forces, to the producing of new effects; and they, therefore, none the less that he himself is blind to their teachings, lead the mind logically upward to the recognition of an infinitely higher power, of some analogous kind, in the omnipotent, omnipresent, all-wise Creator.

Apply what we have been saying to the subject of

Digitized by Google

some special creations and some special providences, and you will see all objections to be swept away. If the special creations were merely new forms or new embodiments of pre-existent materials, differing from previous creations only in exhibiting new phenomena or producing new effects, they might spring solely from adjustment or combination of some forces, and would comport thoroughly with the invariability and permanence of all. If the special providences also have all been of similar character, merely new manifestations or new forms with new appearances or new effects, then they too may all have accorded perfectly with the invariability and permanence of all the forces. Apply what we have said even to some of the most striking of the miracles, and you will see all objections to be swept away. All the miracles, of course, and all the special creations, and the special providences too, display a knowledge and a power infinitely higher than man's; not only infinitely higher than man's now, but infinitely higher than any which man ever can attain. They are Divine works; they are works of a magnitude which no creature can perform and even when done at the hands or through the mouth of divinely commissioned men, as Moses, the prophets and the apostles, they were done by God "according to His own will." But the question here is not their supereminence, not their manifestation of Divine working That, indeed, is to be borne in mind; it requires to be kept clearly and fully in view; and it explains everything about them which soars above the doings and the comprehensions of human science. But that is not the question here, nor can it come up as a question at all The persons against whom we are arguing admit God's existence, and therefore His infinitude. They do not

Digitized by Google

set aside His omnipotence absolutely; they set it aside only in its relation to the world's forces. Their one objection, or the aggregate of all their objections, is the alleged incompatibility of its exercise with the invariableness and permanence of these forces' action. Now that objection, in as far as it concerns any miracles which may be assumed to have been done with pre-existent materials, is completely removed by the facts which we have been adducing.

We shall advance a step in the view of miracles, as to those which were entirely creative, when we arrive at the chapter on Miracles. But look, in the mean time, at such miracles as the manna in the wilderness, the loaves and the fishes, twice during our Lord's ministry, the converting of the waters of Egypt into blood before the exode of the Israelites, and the turning of water into wine at Cana of Galilee.[1] The matter or form or result of these miracles presents nothing peculiar. The oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen, sulphur, phosphorus, or other elements, or the combinations of these elements in the substances of the miracles, appear to have been strictly the same as in all homogeneous or similar substances which are obtained in ordinary ways. They possessed the same forces, and exerted these forces in the same way, as in all such substances. Even the manner of the miracles does not appear to have been different from the manner of new or extraordinary results obtained by human science, or to have been other than a special adjustment or special combination of pre-existent forces. The measure of the manner alone is what constituted

[1] Exod. xvi. 11-36; Num. xi. 4-9; Exod. vii. 14-21; Matt. xiv. 16-21, and xv. 32-39; Mark vi. 34-44, and viii. 1-9; Luke ix. 12-17; John vi. 5-14; John ii. 1-11.

Digitized by Google

their peculiarity; and that was simply, though magnificently and divinely, a measure of power. Chemistry has not yet reached such a degree of progress as can enable it to combine elements or aggregations of elements into an organic product like manna, bread, fish-flesh, blood, or wine; but it is steadily and astutely aiming its efforts toward the attaining of that power; it believes the power to be theoretically attainable, and to comport perfectly with the invariability and permanence of all known forces; and if it ever shall attain that power, it will itself, out of a collection of the requisite inorganic elements or compounds, evolve lifeless organic products. The very manner of the miracles of the manna, the bread, the fish-flesh, the blood, and the wine will then stand demonstrated; will then appear as consistent with the invariability and permanence of forces as the manner of any ordinary process in the laboratory or the kitchen. Yet the measure of the manner will for ever transcend, not only all human imitation, but all human comprehension. That measure lay within the region of omnipotence. God's power alone could bring together the materials with which the matters or substances of the miracles were produced. But that power is not questioned by the persons against whom we are arguing; and therefore the miracles themselves, even on the very principles maintained by these persons, are beyond question.

Look at another miracle—one which has perhaps been more adversely commented on than any other, and even made the subject of much thoughtless derision—the miracle of causing a piece of iron to float. This occurred on occasion of the school of prophets under Elisha removing to the Jordan, and there constructing for them-

Digitized by Google

selves a proper habitation, and is narrated as follows: "As one was felling a beam, the axe-head fell into the water; and he cried and said, Alas, master! for it was borrowed. And the man of God said, Where fell it? And he showed him the place. And he cut down a stick and cast it in thither, and the iron did swim. Therefore, said he, take it up to thee. And he put out his hand and took it."[1] The word translated "swim," of course, ought to have been translated "float." The chief objection is, that iron has a specific gravity nearly eight times greater than water, and that therefore to make it float on water is as impossible as to make eight to be only one. Were we to say that sodium or potassium is lighter than water, and floats on it, we should of course be reminded that sodium or potassium is not iron; yet we, nevertheless, point out the fact that a true metal may float; and we also suggest the possibility that a heavy metal may be put into conditions to make it float. Is iron known to exist in any such conditions? Not exactly, indeed; yet it is known to exist in some conditions considerably similar to floating ones, and in many conditions remarkably different from its normal ones. It exists in perfect solution in ink, in blood, in tincture, in water itself; it exists so invisibly and diffusedly in chalybeate water that ill-informed persons would be more astonished to be told that it always exists there, than to be told that a piece of it was once made to float on river-water; it exists in many forms of fine powder and pellucid salt; it passes readily from one kind of form into a contrasted kind; it glides imperceptibly round a circle of changes from mineral to animal, and from animal to mineral; it even submits to com-

[1] 2 Kings vi. 5–7.

Digitized by Google

bustion in oxygen, burning with great brilliancy, and emitting a dazzling light; and it therefore has an enormous capacity of transmutation—a capacity of going into numerous conditions, exceedingly different from one another, and some of them utter contrasts to its native state. Take these facts into view, and you will not say that, consistently with the invariability and permanence of forces, God could not make it float. You merely do not know the precise forces which were adjusted or combined to make the axe-head float; but you know well that other forces combine to make pieces of iron do things very wonderful; you therefore have only to acknowledge that your chemistry is not yet perfect, and to remember that the measure of applying the forces in a miracle is a measure of omnipotence; and you then admit the miracle of the axe-head floating. And if you object further that the occasion of that miracle was a trivial one, you simply make a great mistake. The occasion was really important and magnificent. The schools of the prophets, amid the general defection of Elisha's time, and with a commission to restore and propagate the true religion all around them, were situated not dissimilarly, though in a smaller way, to the apostles of Christ at the commencement of the new dispensation; and they got confirmation to their faith, inspiritment to their zeal, and Divine attestation to their message from this miracle, just as the apostles got the same things from the miracles which were done among them. And if the narrative of the miracle is remarkably concise and simple; if it is entirely free from the dilatation and pretentiousness which occur more or less in every fabricated account of a marvellous event, that character of it is just another proof that the narrative is true.

Digitized by Google

Let us now pass to a view of higher forces; to a view of the forces which rule intellect and conscience, which sway individual men in their thinking and conduct, and which sway families, societies, communities, and nations. These have connexions with organization; they maintain reciprocities with the forces of the animal life; they communicate, through these, both by impulsion and by impact, with the physical forces of the outer world; yet, in themselves, they are spiritual, subtle, and known only by consciousness, and they do not admit of being treated in the same classifying and demonstrating way as physical forces. One of the most obvious groups of them, and one of the most important to be considered, is the group which lies around the will, or is concerned in acts of volition; and that cannot be investigated beyond the surface without plunging into the profound and complicated controversy respecting the doctrine of free-agency. All the others, or at least most of them, are so far similar that any discussion of them, beyond the surface, would carry us right into the centre of the endless and ever varying conflict among theories of metaphysics. Hence must all persons, for the purposes of our present argument, look at the intellectual and the moral forces only on their surface; but happily all can distinctly see there such ample play of these forces as will enable them to see clearly how they work, and to judge easily what results flow from their invariability and permanence.

Now we ask each man, as an individual, whether he is conscious of possessing control over his own thoughts and moral actions? We, of course, speak of that control within limits; for we showed, in our former chapter, that "a natural man" thinks only "natural" thoughts, and does only "natural" deeds—that he does not possess,

Digitized by Google

does not receive, and therefore does not so much as excogitate, any thoughts of a purely or properly Christian kind; and we might show, on parity of principle, that no man controls thoughts or actions within any sphere of knowledge whatever which he has not entered—that, for example, no savage can control thoughts or actions relating to civil refinements, the fine arts, or the advanced sciences. But in so far as a man's knowledge goes, in so far as he has obtained enlightenment, or in so far as he lives above mere instinct and prejudice, we ask each man, as an individual, whether or not he feels himself to possess and to exercise a control over his own thoughts, to modify them, to adjust them, to turn them hither and thither, and a corresponding control over the actions to which they lead? Every man, doubtless, will answer in the affirmative. But an opponent of our argument, when giving his affirmative answer, will remind us that he regards all the thoughts, and all the resulting actions, as determined by invariable and permanent forces. What matters that? He admits that he controls the thoughts, modifies them, adjusts them; and as the forces are in the thought, he of course controls, modifies, adjusts the forces.

We ask, again, whether man has power to control the thoughts and moral actions of his fellow-men? What a needless question! All society rests and works on that power. Speaking, teaching, training, preaching, lecturing, buying, selling, promising, threatening, reasoning, and governing, all proceed upon it. What are the efforts of parents, tutors, schoolmasters, professors, disciplinarians, promoters of science, traders, commercial speculators, magistrates, legislators, and statesmen, but a continual and various use of a power to control the thoughts and

Digitized by Google

moral actions of their fellow-men? Nor is that power wielded in speech only, but also in looks, in grimaces, in gesticulations, in writing, in printing, and by telegraph. A mere look may sometimes thrill a family; a grimace may flash on a company, lighting them suddenly up from gravity to laughter; a short paragraph may rush like a breeze across a community; a telegram may go like a shock through a nation, rousing strong emotion everywhere, and making all tongues move. What vivid effect was produced throughout Britain by the telegrams, "Sebastopol is taken," "Magdala is in sight"! Do not say then, for no sane person imagines, that man has not power of control, within clear limits, over the thoughts and the consequent actions of his fellow-men. And if man has it over men within limits, why should not God have it over man beyond limits? Nothing in the invariability and permanence of forces hinders it on the part of man; and nothing in them can hinder it on the part of God. Nor is any medium of operation, not even such slender medium as a sound, a glance, or a sign, indispensable to Him. His omnipresence and omnipotence can make any operations to be direct. "He is the governor among the nations."[1] "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the rivers of water; He turneth it whithersoever He will."[2] "He stilleth the tumult of the people."[3] "They say, the Lord shall not see, neither shall the God of Jacob regard. Understand, ye brutish among the people, and ye fools, when will ye be wise? He that planted the ear, shall He not hear? He that formed the eye, shall not He see? He that chastiseth the heathen, shall not He correct? He that teacheth man knowledge, shall He not know?[4] He wields a

[1] Psa. xxii. 28. [2] Prov. xxi. 1. [3] Psa. lxv. 7. [4] Psa. xciv. 7–10.

Digitized by Google

sway over the minds of men; and, simply by that sway, He does all the work of ordinary moral Providence.

But can men exercise such control over the minds of their fellow-men as to produce extraordinary or special events? All history says that they both can and do. What are some revolutionary schemes, some conspiracies, some crusadings, some deep diplomacies, some despotic fulminations, some great legislative enactments, some strong strokes of policy, some extensive colonizations, some grand philanthropic enterprises, but so many successful exercises of man's control over the minds of multitudes to effect extraordinary changes in the very structure of society? Or what have been some of the doings of learned and scientific men, such as those at the revival of literature in Europe, or those of the formation and proceedings of scientific associations, or those of the announcement and promulgation of great discoveries and inventions, but so many successful exertions of control over mind, to turn the thoughts of nations into new channels, to impress a new character on popular ideas, and to accomplish sudden and sweeping changes in the habits, the aspirations, and the employments of nations? History teems with instances of extraordinary events resulting from the control of a few minds, or of even one mind, over many. Nor have any of these, or all of them together, ever disturbed for a moment the invariability and permanence of moral forces. Why then should there be an instant's hesitation in admitting the fact of a special providence? Man's control over the minds of his fellow-men, for the production of extraordinary events, is a clear analogue, though a very poor and feeble one, of the unlimited control exercised by the Infinite Deity.

Digitized by Google

The illustration we have given extends still further. Take it as showing that another's operation on the minds of men makes no interference with the invariability and permanence of moral forces, and it will lead you to the recognition of moral miracle. That kind of miracle, if you contemplate it clearly, will strike you more than a physical miracle, and it was a kind of miracle frequently done by our Lord. He stood again and again in the midst of multitudes of fiery zealots who were desirous to kill Him, and would have esteemed it a religious duty to hurt Him; He propounded to them things in the very teeth of their prejudices, and most exasperating to their feelings; He passed freely among these multitudes, and continued freely to expose their follies, after both they and He knew that emissaries were among them armed with authority from the Sanhedrim to take Him; He went with them into the very temple, the grand arena of the national gatherings, the special place of the Sanhedrim's presence and power, and day by day lashed them with His expositions there; He even, in the midst of many tens of thousands, and under the immediate eye of the temple magnates, made a scourge of small cords, drove all out who sold oxen and sheep and doves, and all the changers of money there—drove out also all the live stock of their merchandise, and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables.[1] He thus assailed their avarice, attacked their keen sense of pecuniary advantage in the prostitution of religion, tore off violently the flimsy veil which they had thrown over facilitation of sacrifice in order to make it a means of worldly gain; He followed up his deeds with renewed and sharp expostulations, cutting their

[1] John ii. 13-17.

Digitized by Google

hypocrisy to the core; he was all the while raimented like a poor man, immersed in all sorts of foul reproaches and calumnies, an utter contrast to the richly-robed and high-famed authorities around; He was all the while also "the observed of all observers," an isolated person acting and speaking against every individual of the interested, excited, fanatical, bloodthirsty tens of thousands; He knew every moment that all wished to kill him, or, at the least, to capture and hurt him, and that those in authority had given command and sent officers to take Him; and yet, by His power over their minds, He repressed them all, held them all silent and inactive, kept perfectly down the passions and impulses of all, rendered the whole mass of them as harmless toward Him as the pavement beneath their feet.[1] "They sought to take Him, but no man laid hands upon Him, because His hour was not yet come." Not only so; but "many of the people believed on Him, and said, When Christ cometh, will He do more miracles than these which this man hath done?"[2]

Look now at what the Bible describes as a new birth, a new creation, a passing from death to life. This is a striking moral miracle, and it possesses unutterable, spiritual, eternal, importance for mankind. It takes place in every "natural man" who becomes a Christian; it is the main and highest outcome of the influences of revelation on the human mind; it is the result, in believing men and women, of the mediatorial reign on earth; it exhibits the practical side of all the things in Christianity which have been termed supernatural. Yet it is done strictly according to the ordinary working, and according to the invariability and permanence,

[1] John vii. 40-44, and viii. 12-20. [2] John vii. 30, 31.

Digitized by Google

of moral forces; it is done through means of enlightenment, persuasion, and conviction; it is done by the Holy Spirit unfolding truth to the mind, presenting truth in its own evidence, and lodging truth with its own evidence in the understanding and the conscience. A man who undergoes it, undergoes it "by the word of truth;" he considers, reflects, knows, and believes; "he is judged of all and convinced of all." What takes place upon him takes place in the same manner of exercising his intellectual faculties as when he hears and believes any doctrines of science. Yet is the change which he experiences, or the deed which is done upon him, really morally miraculous. It is a deed immensely beyond the power of man to do; it is a deed which even the Deity Himself does, or which He could consistently do, only in virtue of the incarnation, substitution, and atoning sacrifice of the Son of God; it is a deed done by the Holy Spirit, in the same special order of the redemptional economy by which also the Holy Spirit gave the sacred Scriptures; and it is a deed evolving results unspeakably grander than any which ever, in any instance, accrued from the strongest and wisest control or use of moral forces on the part of men. Whether it occurred in Adam, we cannot tell; but it occurred in Abel; it has occurred in every truly religious man from Abel's time till now; it will occur in every truly religious man till the end of time; and the continual occurrence of it in all truly religious men alone has prevented the earth from becoming literally a hell. Paul's experience was a good example of it, when he was suddenly converted from the character of "a blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious" to the character of a devout, meek, and loving apostle; the experiences of

Digitized by Google

Africaner, Colonel Gardiner, John Newton, and multitudes of others in modern times, were good examples of it, when they suddenly passed from the condition of truculent savages, coarse sensualists, or brutal slave-dealers, to the condition of holy, wise, benevolent men; the experiences of all genuine believers of Divine truth, in all ages and climes, have been examples of it, when they found, as to their desires, their affections, and their modes of thinking, all old things passing away, and all things becoming new;[1] and the experiences of all men living at the period of the millennial glory will be examples of it, when, in virtue of the full effects of Messiah's reign, "the people shall be all righteous,"[2] and when "the wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox; and the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp; and the weaned child shall put its hand on the cockatrice' den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."[3]

We are now led to the question of revelation. Every difficulty on this question also, as to compatibility with the invariability and permanence of forces, is removed by the considerations which we have been adducing. Nothing meets us here in the slightest degree unaccordant with the ordinary operations of the human mind. Man's mind takes impressions and receives ideas from mere physical agencies, light, sound, odours,

[1] 2 Cor. v. 17. [2] Isa. lx. 21. [3] Isa. xi. 6–9.

Digitized by Google

gases, and other things, acting through his bodily organs; and why should it not, in selected instances, have received special impressions or special trains of ideas from the direct agency of God? Individual men receive and understand currents of thought poured into their mind by the action of fellow-men; and why should not individual men have received and understood currents of thought poured into their mind by their Creator? Pupils acquire details of all kinds of secular and scientific knowledge by fallible impacts on their intellect; and why should not some selected persons have acquired details of sacred knowledge by infallible impact? Men receive, from all quarters, communications of all kinds, or on all subjects, exactly in the light and the evidence of their own character; and why should not a few men have received from God a communication of moral law and Christian doctrine, exactly in the light and evidence of its own character? Any amanuenses write down the exact words and sentences dictated by a person of superior intelligence, whether they themselves understand them or not; and why should not some selected individuals, acting as amanuenses, have written down the exact words and sentences dictated by the infinitely intelligent Deity, whether they themselves understood them or not? Historians commit matters to writing on the evidence of fallible human testimony, received through their ears; savants commit matters to writing on the evidence of partial experiments, or obscure phenomena, received through their eyes; and why may not certain "holy men of old" have committed matters to writing on the evidence of infallible Divine suggestion, received directly by their mind? God could have given man a knowledge of His will creatively, making it an

Digitized by Google

intuition; He could have lodged it in a separate faculty, as He has lodged a sense of right and wrong in conscience; and He could no less surely, knowing that to be the better way, communicate it by suggestion to selected individuals, giving them conviction of what it was, and impelling them to write it down. Other points relating to revelation, as actually existing in the Scriptures, will come to be noticed in a separate publication.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER III.

CREATION.

Theories of the world's origin. The primal world made by God out of nothing. Progression in the world's formation. Special creations. Connexion of creation with the mediatorial reign. How that reign is to be understood. Universality of it in both space and time. Future duration and end of the world. How the Deity is revealed on earth. Import of the name Jehovah. Relations of the Pre-Adamite world to the mediatorial reign. Why the Pre-Adamite animals were subject to death. Preparation of the earth, from the beginning onward, for man. Connexion of creation with the Sabbath and with Sabbatism.

CREATION is viewed sometimes in the light of philosophy, sometimes in the light of revelation, sometimes in the light of both. It is understood sometimes as primal or relative to origin; sometimes as special or relative to subsequent formations. And it is discussed sometimes with regard to our world only; sometimes with regard to the universe. Our plan requires us to view it in the conjoint light of philosophy and revelation; to understand it as both primal and special; and to discuss it with regard to the universe only in so far as any parts of the universe have relations to our world.

The origin of the world has been the subject of numerous and various philosophical theories, both ancient

Digitized by Google

and modern. Some of these are very wild; several rest on bases of legend and mythology; most are sheer hypotheses, without a grain of argument from induction; the best are fabrics of technical terms, without a thread of real meaning; and not one deserves a moment's serious attention. The question of the world's origin, discuss it how men may, presents only the alternative of eternal self-existent matter or a Divine Creator. Nor, if clearly considered even for one instant, does it permit us to entertain that alternative, but shuts us up at once, inevitably and conclusively, to believe in all primal creation as the work of God. The notion of eternal self-existent matter contradicts and shocks our reason; cannot possibly be expressed in intelligible language—in any definitional or explanatory phrases whose terms do not contradict one another; and, in so far as attempts have been made to work it into shape, unavoidably resolves itself into either the notion of nothing or the notion of an infinite intelligent Creator. We took some notice of it in our chapter on Nature, and we do not need to notice it again. Belief in God as the creator of the world or as alone having given it origin, is the only belief on the subject which comports with reason; the only one which the understanding can entertain; the only one which admits of self-consistent and intelligible expression, either as regards the world's origin itself, or as regards the evolution or formations which succeeded. It is also a belief coinciding with man's intuition of God's existence; and it is the only belief on the subject which revelation inculcates, sanctions, or admits.

A neecssary consequence is, that the primal world was made out of nothing. Had any material been used for it, that material, of course, would have been pre-existent,

Digitized by Google

and would itself have been the primal or embryonic world. The mere impossibility of the self-existence of matter proves that the world was made out of nothing; and the mere fact that God made it proves the same thing. He is a Spirit; He is not matter; and therefore he made the world not out of Himself, but out of nothing. As to how He did it, we can neither tell nor comprehend. We can do no more than say, "He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast." [1] The act was strictly, supereminently, stupendously Divine. It had no resemblance to any act of making possible to a creature; no resemblance to the highest conceivable act of making done by the highest conceivable created being. Any act of making by the mightiest creature would at best be a making out of something; but this was a making, a most magnificent making, the making of the world, out of nothing. The very uniqueness of it, conjoined with its stupendousness, manifested the omnipotence and the Godhead of the maker. The work of creation is often named and dilated on in Scripture as displaying the glory of the Deity; and, while it clearly declares Him to be infinitely great by its details, it no less does so by its origin. His power, His prescience, His wisdom, His omnipresence, and His beneficence are gloriously evinced, in myriads of ways, by the world's constituences and motions; and His entire Godhead was no less surely evinced by the act of His making all its materials out of nothing.

A doubt has sometimes been expressed as to the fact of creation out of nothing being taught in the Bible. Some critics say that the Hebrew word rendered "create" includes, indeed, the sense of "make out of nothing," but

[1] Psa. xxxiii. 9.

Digitized by Google

also includes the sense of "make out of something;" others, that it resembles the words rendered "make" and "form," with simply the difference that it has a stronger force than they; others, even that it is so nearly akin to these words as to be capable of being used interchangeably with them. But the very passages to which all these critics refer for vindication of their opinion, substantially refute them. One of these passages says, "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made."[1] This is alleged to show that the words "created" and "made" denote the same act, or are used indifferently. If it did so, it would contain as sheer a tautology as ever occurred in the most careless piece of writing, and such as can nowhere else be found in the Bible. Every separate word in every part of the sacred books has a separate meaning; and each of the two quoted words here has a meaning for itself. "Created" denotes the primal act which God did—the originating of the world; and "made" denotes the acts which followed—the forming of minerals and plants and animals during the "six days." Another passage says, "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day."[2] This is alleged to show that the word "made" is used where we might have expected the word "created," and that therefore the latter may have, at times or even always, no higher meaning than the former. But the entire passage speaks of what was done in the "six days;" speaks not at all of the primal act, denoted in the previous chapter by "created;" speaks only of the forming acts which followed the primal one; and though it mentions "heaven"

[1] Gen. ii. 3. [2] Exod. xx. 11.

Digitized by Google

as well as "earth," it points there to our world's heaven, and alludes there to what was done on the second and the fourth days. Another passsage says, "I have created him for My glory; I have formed him; yea, I have made him." [1] This is alleged to show that the words "created," "formed," and "made" denote the same act, or are used indifferently. If it did, it would contain a double tautology, bald and meaningless, such as scarcely a child would utter. It refers to the moral life, to the renovation of a "natural man," to the "new creation in Christ Jesus;" it employs its terms, not in a physical sense, but in a moral one; it figures the new moral condition of a Christian as a world; and it describes that condition as successively created, formed, and made by God, or as successively originated, developed, and matured by the Holy Spirit. Every true Christian who reflects upon it instantly feels its point and sees its beauty. Again, two passages are put side by side, with the alleged view of showing that they severally apply the words "created" and "formed" to the same act. The one is, "God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them;" [2] and the other is, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." [3] But the former refers to man's soul, which was not made out of matter; and the latter refers to his body, which was made out of the dust of the ground. These passages, then, though adduced by adverse critics for an opposite purpose, rather help than hinder us to understand "created" in the sense of literally "made out of nothing" in such passages as the following:—"In the beginning God

[1] Isa. xliii. 7. [2] Gen. i. 27. [3] Gen. ii. 7.

Digitized by Google

created the heaven and the earth."[1] "'Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number."[2] "God the Lord created the heavens, and stretched them out; He spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it."[3] "Praise ye Him, sun and moon; praise Him, all ye stars of light; praise Him, ye heaven of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens; let them praise the name of the Lord; for He commanded, and they were created."[4] "He that liveth for ever and ever created heaven and the things that therein are, and the earth and the things that therein are, and the sea and the things which are therein."[5] "In those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time."[6] "God created all things by Jesus Christ."[7] "By Him who is the image of the invisible God, were all things created that are in heaven and that are in the earth, visible and invisible."[8] "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power; for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created."[9]

Other passages also either expressly say, or distinctly imply, that the world was made out of nothing. "Through faith," says the epistle to the Hebrews, "we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."[10] Wisdom, or the impersonation of the Son of God, says, "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was."[11] Paul, writing to Timothy, says, "God hath saved us, and

[1] Gen. i. 1. [2] Isa. xl. 26. [3] Isa. xlii. 5. [4] Psa. cxlviii. 3–5. [5] Rev. x. 6. [6] Mark xiii. 19. [7] Eph. iii. 9. [8] Col. i. 15, 16. [9] Rev. iv. 11. [10] Heb. xi. 3. [11] Prov. viii. 23.

Digitized by Google

called us with an holy calling, according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."[1] Our Lord, in his intercessory prayer, says, "O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was."[2] Moses, addressing the Most High in one of the Psalms, says, "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God."[3] Job says, "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing."[4] The Most High Himself, speaking to Job, says, "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the corner-stone thereof?"[5] And He says again, speaking to His Church, "Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not neither is weary? There is no searching of His understanding."[6] All passages, indeed, which refer to the origin of things, or which note the perfection and glory of the Deity as manifested by the work of creation, more or less distinctly imply that the world was made out of nothing. They do not say, in formal terms, that the world was made out of nothing; neither do all of them say, in formal terms, that the Deity is self-existent; but they seem to assume or imply the one fact as well as the other. To speak of God at all is to speak of Him as self-existent; and to speak of creation at all is to speak of it as creation out of nothing.

The fact that the world was made out of nothing is

[1] 2 Tim. i. 9.
[2] Job xxvi. 7.
[3] John xvii. 5.
[4] Job xxxviii. 4–6.
[5] Psa. xc. 2.
[6] Isa. xl. 28.

Digitized by Google

not merely a fact, but also a great doctrine, or rather a cluster of great doctrines. Nowhere is any fact stated in the Bible simply as a bald fact; but anywhere is any fact stated there to exhibit a truth, to inculcate a duty, or do both. The stupendous fact that the world was made out of nothing, or tantamountly that the world was created—a fact stated so frequently, and stated in such various connections—is therefore a fact of high and various didactic and moral import—of import high and various correspondently with its own stupendous character. The statement in the commencing sentence of the Bible, "God created the heaven and the earth," was not written to make us stare, much less to let us be unreflecting and stupid like brute beasts; but was written to give us knowledge of the Godhead and glory of the Creator, and to incite us to adore and obey Him. The numerous statements respecting the creation in other passages, as well in those which we have quoted as in many others, were all written with the same grand general design; and most of them, or all such as occur in any special connexions, exhibit some special phases of great truth, or inculcate some special phases of great duty. One grand outcome of some of them, which we shall afterwards have to notice, is relation to sabbatism; and a grand aggregate outcome of the teachings of all of them, or of the effect of these teachings on the mind and conscience, is seen in many of the psalmic compositions which are provided for the devotional use of all religious men. Such are the following:—"O Lord our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth! who hast set Thy glory above the heavens. When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained; what is man, that

Digitized by Google

Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that Thou visitest him?"[1] "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handywork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world."[2] "Bless the Lord, O my soul. O Lord my God, Thou art very great; Thou art clothed with honour and majesty; who coverest Thyself with light as with a garment; who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain; who laid the foundations of the earth, that it should not be removed for ever."[3] "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help; my help cometh from the Lord, who made heaven and earth."[4] "Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help, whose hope is in the Lord his God, who made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that therein is."[5]

The fact that the world was made out of nothing, in addition to its direct teachings, involves the doctrine of providence, and corrects the errors in the theory of "natural laws" or physical forces. The creation was formed not only for the first moments of its existence, but for all time. The duration which it was to run, or all the changes which it should ever undergo, and all the vicissitudes to which any portions of it should ever be subject, were in the intention of the Creator, and lay before Him as a perpetual now. He "saw the end from the beginning," and also everything which should intervene. The world which He made was not a half-formed mass, capable of ever becoming anything, even in the

[1] Psa. viii. 1–4. [2] Psa. xix. 1–4. [3] Psa. civ. 1–5.
[4] Psa. cxxi. 1, 2. [5] Psa. cxlvi. 5, 6.

Digitized by Google

slightest degree different, in even its smallest constituent, from what He purposed; still less was it an utterly undesigned mass, hurled away from His hand and from His care, to become anything whatever which independent properties within, or fortuitous chances without, might gradually render it; but it was a perfect system of matter, moulded by omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, infinitely wise, and infinitely beneficent design, and launched into a divinely defined course of existence, to run every moment of that course exactly in the line, in the manner, and with the results, as regarded both the entire mass and each one of even the minutest of its portions, which the creative purpose had determined. Its properties were complete in at once number, kind, and energy to fit it, not only for all it was at first, but for all it should ever become; and they lay before the Creator's view, not only as they worked at the outset, but as they should work, or as anything ever arising out of them should work, through all successive moments till the end of time. All things about the world made out of nothing, its mass, its properties, its destined developments, from the earliest minerals to the latest animals, and to the latest interests of the latest, were present to the Infinite Intelligence as a single thought. The duration of all, with every successive element of that duration, was or is, in its relation to Him, a perpetual now. He has been over all and in all and through all in every moment of that duration, just as He was over all and in all and through all at the commencement. His act of creation and his acts of providence look separately from each other to us, because they are sundered in our view by the measurements of time; but they are one thought to Him, or have one and

Digitized by Google

the same relation to His design or purpose, because "He is from everlasting to everlasting," and "worketh all things after the counsel of His own will." There is, therefore, no room for any "natural laws" or independent forces. The things so called either must be God's own workings, or they must be properties which He imparted, maintains, and controls.

A progression in the world's formation, from an embryonic condition at the commencement to a completed state at the creation of man, is recognized both by philosophers and by Christians. Some philosophers call it an evolution, or a natural and gradual process; some call it a development, either throughout or only subsequent to what they term the first types of organic species; some call it an ascending series of creation, from lower forms of being to higher ones; and Christians call it the work of "the six days" mentioned in the first chapter of Genesis and in the fourth commandment. The views of it, on all hands, are various and conflicting; and they now turn mainly on the discoveries and progress of geological science, and can scarcely be said, in any instance, to be yet matured. Those entertained by many philosophers coincide with the theories of "nature" and of "natural laws" which we have already combated; and those entertained by other philosophers, and by all Christians, consist mainly in expositions of the first chapter of Genesis, or in harmonizings of these with geognostic phenomena. One exposition of the first chapter of Genesis by some Christians regards it as a myth, to be read entirely in a moral sense; another regards it as a vision to Moses, to be read in the same way as the visions to the prophets; a third regards it, excepting the first verse, as a record of only a final or

Digitized by Google

concluding work during six literal days, ending at the creation of man; and a fourth regards it as a record of operations only on a comparatively small part of the earth's surface, conterminate with the land of Eden. These four views all depend on mere criticism and hermeneutics, and do not come within the scope of our discussion. The views of other Christians—including the larger number, and a rapidly increasing number, of all who are well informed in subjects of general knowledge, and also the views of those philosophers who agree with them—regard the first chapter of Genesis as strictly historical, and as all coinciding, in some way or other, with the geological reading of the record of successive formations as found in the earth's crust. Even these views, though similar to one another, or even identical as a whole, are very various in details; take complexion from varieties of ways in which the sacred narrative, and especially the geological record, are rendered; and cannot be expected to come into full agreement, both till geological research and analysis shall have reached vastly higher points than they have yet attained, and till other sciences, particularly electricity, chemistry, biology, and physiology, shall have been brought to co-operate vastly more than they have yet done with the studies of geology. We, nevertheless, regard every Christian teacher, in consideration of the present unsettled state of general inquiry, as bound to adopt or to form a view, with all possible carefulness, up to the extent of whatever materials he can find for it; and we, accordingly, after examination of other views, and with appreciation and adoption of as much of them as appeared to rest on fair evidence, have formed a view of our own; but we could neither give a detail of that

Digitized by Google

view, nor enter properly into the topic of successive formations at all, within proper limits here ; and we must postpone the discussion of the subject to a more suitable place.

The one aspect of successive formations appropriate here is that of special creations. This aspect contrasts to the theory of what is called natural development of species, or formation of species by natural selection ; and is of very high moment. The doctrine of special creations covers all formations subsequent to those of the embryonic world ; has reference as well to new mineral aggregations or new mineral conditions, as to the origin of organic forms, and to new and successive vegetable and animal species ; contemplates as well the works done in the first and the second days of the first chapter of Genesis, as the works done in the four following days ; and pronounces every new formation, of whatever kind, from the earliest to the latest, a special creation. The theory of the formation of species by natural selection takes a less extensive sweep ; says nothing respecting the merely mineral periods of the world's cosmical history ; admits, either silently or by frank avowal, the special creation of what it calls the primal types of plants and animals ; and attempts to find the origin of all species upward from these primal types in the mere working of "natural laws" or forces, considered apart from God, or in what it calls natural development. The best of its advocates, however, assign as the main alleged evidence for it what they term economy of forces. They think that philosophy requires them, as they say, to minimize forces—that it forbids them to contemplate a successive expenditure of forces if a single commencing force could be seen or argued to be enough ; and they

Digitized by Google

therefore try to exhibit all the forces concerned in the origination of the successive multitudes of species of plants and animals as simply the development of the forces in the primal types, and call that economy. Their reasoning might be apposite if applied to the stores of a kitchen, a laboratory, a factory, or an army; but it is both inapposite and revolting as applied to the Divine creative power. Economy is appropriate and wise in the expenditure of all good human resources, always because these are always limited, and often also because they cannot be replenished; but it has no place and no meaning in reference to the workings of the infinite Deity. "Hast thou not known that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?" [1] The exercise of His omnipotence, even as the Creator, or in works of creating, admits of no exhaustion, no diminution, no impairment, no economizing; but, after any amount of work, in any number of ways, through any extent of duration, is unchangeably the same. And as God was glorified by the primal creation, so has He been glorified by every special creation. Not the withholding or the withdrawing of His power, but the continual exercise of it, shows forth His glory. "The things that are made," as well the successive formations as the primal creation, manifest "His eternal power and Godhead." [2] "All things were created by Him," [3] as well the latest as the earliest; and "for His pleasure," all things, the latest as well as the earliest, "are and were created." [4]

Nor can any objection rise against the fact of special creations on the ground of the so-called "natural laws" or forces. Some of these creations, especially such as

[1] Isa. xl. 28. [2] Rom. i. 20. [3] Col. i. 16. [4] Rev. iv. 11.

Digitized by Google

comprised or consisted of the origination of life or mind or intellect or soul, appear to have been creations out of nothing, and therefore have the same character as the primal creation. That creation was irrespective of any force whatever except God's own power; and so also must they have been. They no doubt, indeed, were so constituted as to take part harmoniously in the co-operations and reciprocations which prevail through all God's works; but they were so constituted, not in virtue of any precurrent forces, apart from the Creator's power, but by adaptations within them to such co-operations or reciprocations with all forces exterior to them which they should severally have to perform. So essential is the doctrine of at least these special creations to a rational or philosophical view of the world's cosmical history, that even all the advocates of the very theory of natural development, excepting the sheer materialistic ones, either virtually or overtly accept and avow it. They "postulate," as they say, or take for granted and believe, the special creation of life and of typal organic forms at the end of the entirely mineral periods, in order to have, or as essential for finding, a foundation for the structure of the alleged subsequent development. They see no way from the embryonic condition of the world to the commencement of the series of organic beings, except through the medium of some special creations; nor do they pretend to find any antagonism or discrepancy between these special creations and what they call "the natural laws." Why, then, should they hesitate to regard as special creations also all new species? Why, especially, should they demur for a moment to regard as such the numerous new species which possess organisms, functions, and powers widely different from

Digitized by Google

those of any or all preceding species? Why, for example, are they not struck at once with the appearance of manifest special creations in the earliest vertebrate animals as distinguished from all the prior invertebrate ones, and in the appearance of intellectual moral man as distinguished from all the prior irrational brutes? Grant that all the physical ingredients in the new species were derived from previously made matter; that these were ruled, while in that matter, by forces pervading it; and that only the life in the new species, the reproductive power, the mind, the intellect, the soul were not so derived; what then? The forces in the previous matter, as we showed in our chapter on the Supernatural, could not hinder such new adjustments or combinations of its ingredients as should fashion them into the organisms of the new species; and at the same time had nothing to do whatever with the life, the mind, the intellect, which were admittedly the subjects of new creations. Every new species, therefore, was in the one respect a creation made out of something; in the other respect, a creation made out of nothing; in the two respects jointly, a decided special creation. Or even looking anteriorly to the time of the earliest organic beings, each new reconstruction of matter itself, with new specific character or new specific forces, was truly, though in less degree, a special creation.

All the special creations, from the earliest onward, have been grand and beautiful. The world at first was an embryo, "without form and void," popularly called a chaos, probably a sluggish mass of gases and vapours. A change came over it, of the character of a special creation, philosophers cannot tell how, but the Bible narrates thus—"The Spirit of God moved upon the face

Digitized by Google

of the waters." How sublime a work was that! so sublime that we can neither comprehend its vastness nor conjecture its details. Another special creation followed, which philosophers recognize as at least a great fact but cannot explain, and which the Bible narrates in one of the sublimest sentences ever penned—"God said, Let there be light, and there was light." The thing created then is denoted by a word which signifies, not only "light," but also "fire" and "lightning;" and it probably was the imponderable *matter*, represented by light, heat, electricity, and chemical affinity, which permeates all mineral bodies, and determines by its various action their various forms and combinations. The creation of it then may have been done for our world only; may have been a creation for the purposes of the earth similar to previous creations for the purposes of other worlds; but, even if so understood, was inexpressibly sublime, both in its immediate results to the earth, and in its prospective adaptations to everything which should be in it till the end of time. Another special creation followed in the forming of the atmosphere; another in the forming of rocks and land; others, by the thousand, in the making of plants, from the lowest to the highest; others, by the thousand, in the making of animals, from zoophytes on to apes; and a crowning one, in the making of erect, rational, accountable man. Any fair enumeration of the wonders of these creations is not possible within less than voluminous limits; would exceed a thousand-fold a fair catalogue of all the mineral, vegetable, and animal wonders in all the museums in the world; and would present a circle of study far more than sufficient to engage an intelligent man's attention throughout a long lifetime. Philosophers recognize all

Digitized by Google

the facts of the creation; they themselves are the chief expounders of them to mankind; and they trace them, in multitudes of long lines of species, from at least the commencement of organic being, through vast periods of duration. Not only so; but they show that the species at any time were exceedingly numerous and exceedingly diversified; that the first series of species died out, and was succeeded by a second; that the second series died out, and was succeeded by a third; that, in a word, series followed series in a long succession, prior to the appearance of the species which now exist. The only thing about these wonderful facts which any of the philosophers deny, is that they originated in special creation. How astounding is their denial of that! How astounding also that, instead of ascribing the facts to special creation by God, they labour to assign them to an alleged blind working of what they call "natural laws"! Yet is their case not without a parallel. The ancient sages did something substantially the same; for "when they knew God," from the manifestation of His eternal power and Godhead in the works of His creation, "they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and four-footed beasts and creeping things."[1]

The evidences of special creation are everywhere, on everything, in characters as distinct as those on the Divine wonders in Egypt, which made the very heathen magicians exclaim, "This is the finger of God!"[2] You

[1] Rom. i. 20–23. [2] Exod. viii. 19.

Digitized by Google

see them in all those diversities, differences, and contrasts of organization which are noticed or indicated in the works on what is improperly called natural theology or physico-theology, and which are described, with more or less fulness, in all the best works on vegetable and animal physiology. You see them in the adaptations of organization in each species to its destined modes of life, particularly and strikingly as viewed in connexion with the endless diversities and the innumerable contrasts of these modes of life in the myriads of species. You see them also in the various and contrasted proclivities of the species of plants, and in the various and contrasted instincts of the species of animals. You see them likewise in the chasms or separations between order and order of being, or between kind and kind of organism or function, in the scale of gradation from low to high, and in the succession of time in the world's cosmical history. Look at the chasm between the pristine gases and the crystallized rocks; between the inorganic and the organic creatures; between the cryptogamic plants propagating by sporules, and the phanerogamic ones propagating by seeds; between endogens with increment of growth inward, and exogens with increment of growth outward; between lichens and mosses fastened on bare rocks by rostels, and shrubs and trees anchored deeply in the soil by roots; between filamentous plantlets floating on water and profusely branched plants flourishing on land; between the pulpy seeds of the herbs of the field and the hard, massive, diversified fruits of the trees of the forest; between prevailing lignin or woody structure in plants and prevailing fibrin or fleshy structure in animals; between vegetable nutrition from without and animal nutrition from within; between the vascular

Digitized by Google

system of mere ascent and descent in plants and the vascular system of circulation in animals; between the vegetable air-function of inhaling carbonic acid and exhaling oxygen and the animal air-function of inhaling oxygen and exhaling carbonic acid; between the organic supports of invertebrate animals and the organic supports of vertebrate ones; between the presence of a mere gelatinous fluid in radiates and the elaboration of albuminous blood in vertebrates; between the fewness of vital functions in the earlier animal denizens of the sea and the multitudinousness of vital functions in the later animal denizens of the land; between reproductiveness by division, reproductiveness by ovules or eggs, and reproductiveness by parturition; between the backbone of fishes, the backbone of birds, and the backbone of mammals; between the backbone of one order of mammals and the backbone of another; between the ganglions of the lower animals and the brain-system of the higher ones; between the anterior fins of fishes, the wings of birds, and the front feet of quadrupeds; between the eyes and ears, the mouth and teeth, the stomach and alimentary canal of many orders of animals from low ones up to high ones; between the front feet of carnivora, the front feet of solipeds, the front limbs of bats, the front limbs of apes, and the hands of man; between the sensorial functions of the invertebrates, the perceptive powers of the successive orders of vertebrates, and the intellectual faculties, the subtle will, and the conscience of human beings;—look at these chasms, and at many others, between order and order of creatures; look at them in their respective connexions with specific modes of existence, and with specific reciprocations of action with all things around them;

Digitized by Google

remember also that they mark transition of time as well as transition of form and of function; and, if you are not fettered by a foregone conclusion, you will not fail to see in them overwhelming evidences of special creation. Any attempts to resolve them into mere development by slow and gradual operation of "natural laws" assume appearances of speciousness, even in slight degree, only by shutting their broad contrasts entirely out of view, by fixing attention solely on the points of their nearest proximities, and by splitting up and pushing out even these points so as to increase to the uttermost both their number and their magnitude. A very litttle ingenuity, in some similar way, might identify the Crystal Palace with a lump of granite or a human being with a wheelbarrow.

Special creation goes much further than origination of species. No species ever consisted only of its first pair. Species must be understood either abstractly or concretely; and, if understood abstractly, it is a mere term, or a mere collective notion, and includes no real being; while, if understood concretely, it includes not only the first pair, but all their offspring, through all generations. The first pair of any species were created, not for isolation, but for reproduction; and, in virtue of their reproductivity, had practically in them all their posterity. The germs, the functions, the motivities of action of every subsequent individual of the species are in the first pair; nor in the first pair only, but pass onward to every following pair. "As I may so say, Levi, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham; for he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him." [1] The first pair of every species are related to their off-

[1] Heb. vii. 9, 10.

Digitized by Google

spring somewhat as a fountain is to its effluent stream; they are no more, as individuals, than the commencing link of a long chain; and *they* differ from the parent fountain or the commencing link mainly in having a representative position. All the individuals of a species, as truly as the first pair of it, are God's creatures. Hence is the term "living creature" applied not only to every animal kind as created at the first,[1] but also to every animal kind as living after the flood,[2] and to every animal kind as living in all future ages.[3] Hence also are all men, in all ages, taught to say, "The Lord God hath made us and not we ourselves;"[4] "O come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord our Maker."[5] Hence also is God designated the Maker of men,[6] their faithful Creator,[7] the Maker of both the rich and the poor,[8] the Father of spirits,[9] the Creator of all things.[10] The created condition of each species, in all its essential or specific characters, goes down and into all the individuals of the posterity; but in the vegetable species and in the irrational animal species it admitted of physical variation; and in the human species it admitted of moral variation. Yet the variations are superimposed artificially, and do not impair the fact of the special creation. The physical variations, whether in plant or in animal, even when propagated onward, leave the specific character, and therefore the special creation, untouched; and the moral variation in man, even though introduced or effected by the first pair, and though transmitted by them to all their ordinary

[1] Gen. i. 20-24. [2] Gen. ix. 10, 12, 15. [3] Lev. xi. 46.
[4] Psa. c. 3. [5] Psa. xcv. 6.
[6] Job iv. 17; xxxii. 22; xxxv. 10; xxxvi. 3; Prov. xiv. 31; Isa. li. 13; liv. 5; Hos. viii. 14.
[7] 1 Pet. iv. 19. [8] Prov. xxii. 2. [9] Heb. xii. 9. [10] Col. i. 16; Rev. iv. 11.

Digitized by Google

posterity, also leaves the specific character, and therefore the special creation, untouched. Men, as sinners, first sinned in Adam, for "by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for in him all have sinned;" [1] yet men, as human beings, notwithstanding the moral change which has come over them, retain completely the creature-condition which was given in Adam's creation. And as variationed individuals in any species, considered physically, always retain the forces of the pristine stock so entirely as ever to evince a tendency to throw off the variations; so even men, though so tremendously *variationed* from their original condition, both by sinning in Adam and by personal transgression, nevertheless retain not only the intellectuality which was given at Adam's special creation, but also an innate and axiomatic cognition both of God's existence and of their accountability to Him, and even so much of the active moral sense that "the law is written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." [2] All individual beings in the world, as well all men as all the lower beings, are, in virtue of special creation, the creatures of God.

The fact of special creation, like that of primal creation, is full of doctrine. It teaches the same truths as that fact; it teaches other truths also; and it brings them all into man's intimate relations to all things around him. It shows close at hand that glory of God which the fact of primal creation shows afar off; and it converts field and forest, sea and land, into a book of wisdom for our instruction. Man, at first, was placed amid a grand assemblage of special creations, in a great garden, with

[1] Rom. v. 12. [2] 2. Rom. ii. 15.

Digitized by Google

a great *menagerie*, that he might use them as holy enjoyments in his state of innocence; and man, now, is placed amid the earth's entire, wide, and mixed profusion of special creations, with the thistle as well as the rose, and with the thorny shrub as well as the fruiting tree, that he may use them as monitors to help him back to God. The Bible teems with instructions from these special creations; it uses them, as poets do, to give force and fervour to its descriptions; it uses them also to give metaphoric illustration of many of its highest doctrines and precepts; and it likewise points to their own structure, their functions, and their economy as unfolding, from within themselves, lessons of great weight and beauty. It tells us to "consider the lilies of the field, how they grow," that we may be contented and trustful;[1] to "go to the ant and consider her ways," that we may be industriously wise;[2] and to contemplate the behemoth or hippopotamus and the leviathan or crocodile, that we may humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God.[3] It instructs us also to study our own frame; to mark that we are "fearfully and wonderfully made;" to observe that God's works, as seen in ourselves and everywhere, are "marvellous;" and to say devoutly to our Creator, "Our substance was not hid from thee, when we were made in secret, and curiously *wrought in the lower* parts of the *earth;* thine eyes did see our substance, yet being imperfect; and in Thy book all our members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them."[4] Multitudes of minerals, plants, insects, fishes, birds, quadrupeds, and individual organisms figure in the Scriptures, in a multitude of

[1] Matt. vi. 28. [2] Prov. vi. 6.
[3] Job xl. 15–24; xli. 1–34. [4] Psa. cxxxix. 14–16.

Digitized by Google

connexions or in a multitude of ways, all for the purposes of doctrinal and moral teaching; and they figure there, as surely as the plainest narratives, the most literal statements, or the simplest precepts, in order that they may be considered and understood. Any Christian who does not know or understand them must find all the passages which mention them either wholly or partially sheer blanks in his view. What does he do, or what can he do, in his very devotions, with all or any of the numerous portions of the psalms which descant on these works of God? Any man, too, who would cast out mineralogy, physiology, botany, anatomy, and zoology from the sphere of Christian knowledge, would be no more than consistent if he went on to cast out also morals and ethics. These sciences, and all other sciences which discourse on the works of the Creator, are entirely the Christian's own; they ought never to have been dissevered, even in part, from the Bible teachings of God's character and ways and works; and all of them, in so far as truly rendered, or all portions of them which exhibit facts apart from errors, will most assuredly be yet gathered into recognized union or identity with Christian beliefs. One voice of thought, of faith, and of devotion—only one voice, without a discord—will go up to God, from every clime and nation, from all minds and all hearts, in the glorious coming epoch when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." [1]

These thoughts lead us on to the subject of the connexion of creation with the mediatorial reign. This subject is one of very great moment. Scientific men never mention it; and even many systematic theolo-

[1] Isa. xi. 9.

Digitized by Google

gians do not say much about it; but the Scriptures give it high prominence. It is taught there both as a great doctrine in itself, and as a large element in other great doctrines. Neither the physical world in its moral relations, nor the mediatorial reign in its relations to physical things, nor the manifestations of the Divine character to man, can be properly understood without it. Science commits many errors in consequence of neglecting the light of revelation; and it will never rise above them till it recognizes the connexion of creation with the mediatorial reign. Systematic theology also falls into many grave mistakes, in consequence of neglecting the teachings of Scripture respecting physical things; and it will never escape from them till it admits fully the connexion of the mediatorial reign with the creation. A savant starts without recognition of the mediatorial reign; he proceeds with little regard to the play of moral forces in the world; he goes on to take little account of the intellectual forces; and, as might be expected, he either lands or is in hazard of landing in blank materialism. A systematic theologian also starts with little recognition of the physical world as within and under the mediatorial reign; he proceeds with inadequate or even small regard to the mutual relations between physical and moral things; and, as might be expected, he lands mainly in dry abstract dogmatism. The savant and the systematic theologian, in looking out for manifestations of the Divine character, expect to see them in different ways, on opposite hemispheres; the one looks for them all on the physical side, the other mainly on the moral side; and, as might be expected, they give different accounts of them—far short of that effulgence of glory which may be seen under the teach-

Digitized by Google

ings of the Bible. Both savants and theologians, as well as the plainest men, require to ask here, "What saith the Scripture?"

What saith it, first, respecting the Mediator? "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time."[1] "He is the mediator of the new covenant, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."[2] He is the Word; and "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."[3] He is "the Christ, the Son of the living God."[4] He is "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person."[5] He is "Christ over all, God blessed for ever."[6] He is "the true God and eternal life."[7] He is "our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity."[8] He, the Word, "was made flesh, and dwelt among us; and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."[9] He, the Son of God, sent forth by God, "was made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."[10] He "was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification."[11] He "both died and rose and, revived, that He might be Lord both of the dead and living."[12] He is "the living one, and was dead; and, behold, He is alive for evermore, and has the keys of

[1] 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. [2] Heb. ix. 15. [3] John i. 1.
[4] Matt. xvi. 16. [5] Heb i. 3. [6] Rom. ix. 5.
[7] 1 John v. 20. [8] Titus ii. 13, 14. [9] John i. 14.
[10] Gal. iv. 4, 5. [11] Rom. iv. 25. [12] Rom. xiv. 9.

Digitized by Google

the invisible world and of death."[1] He is "Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty."[2] He is "unto us the child born, and the son given: and the government is upon His shoulder: and His name is Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace; and of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever."[3] He is "the Branch, who builds the temple of the Lord, bears the glory, sits and rules upon His throne, and is a priest upon His throne."[4] He is "the hope set before us, both sure and steadfast: entering into that within the veil, whither as forerunner He is for us entered, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec."[5] He "was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."[6]

What saith the Scripture, next, respecting the manifestations of Deity? "It pleased the Father that in the Son should all fulness dwell."[7] "In Christ dwelleth all

[1] Rev. i. 18. [2] Rev. i. 8. [3] Isa ix. 6, 7. [4] Zech. vi. 12, 13.
[5] Heb. vi. 18–20. [6] Phil. ii. 6–11. [7] Col. i. 19.

Digitized by Google

the fulness of the Godhead bodily."[1] "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."[2] "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."[3] "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him."[4] "Jesus saith unto Thomas, I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me. If ye had known Me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know Him, and have seen Him. Philip saith unto Him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? he that hath seen Me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?"[5] "Behold a voice out of the cloud said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him."[6] "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation: to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."[7] "The God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory . . . . raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand, in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power and might and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come:

[1] Col. ii. 9. [2] 2 Cor. iv. 6. [3] John i. 18. [4] Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22.
[5] John xiv. 6–9. [6] Matt. xvii. 5; Mark ix. 7; Luke ix. 35.
[7] 2 Cor. v. 18, 19.

Digitized by Google

and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the head over all things to the church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."[1]

What saith the Scripture, next, respecting the work of primal creation, and respecting the resultant works of special creation and providence? "All things were made by the Word," who was in the beginning with God, and who was God, "and without Him was not anything made that was made."[2] "God created all things by Jesus Christ."[3] "God hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds. And unto the Son He saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: and Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of Thy hands."[4] "By the Son, who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature, were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist."[5] "He upholdeth all things by the word of His power."[6] "All power is given unto Him in heaven and in earth."[7] "By Him kings reign, and princes decree justice; by Him princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth."[8] "The Lamb shall overcome the enemies of God, for He is Lord of lords, and King of kings."[9] "Our Lord Jesus Christ is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, who

[1] Eph. i. 17–23. [2] John i. 3. [3] Eph. iii. 9. [4] Heb. i. 1–10.
[5] Col. i. 15–17. [6] Heb. i. 3. [7] Matt. xxviii. 18.
[8] Prov. viii. 15, 16. [9] Rev. xvii. 14.

Digitized by Google

only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen nor can see, to whom be honour and power everlasting."[1] "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father."[2] "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at His coming. Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power; for He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet."[3]

These passages, in three groups, are merely selections from many hundreds. They may be regarded, indeed, as of a summary character, exhibiting doctrines concisely and explicitly; but they teach only truths which are taught either directly, constructively, or by implication, throughout the Bible. Some of these truths, as that Christ is God, that He is man, that He is God and man in one person, that He became man by being made of a woman, that He placed Himself under the law as a substitute for sinners, that He obeyed and suffered to the death in self-sacrifice to take away the sin of the world, that He rose from the dead and ascended to heaven, and that He reigns there as both High-priest and King—these truths, and such as these, require to be noted and borne in mind for the purposes of the present discussion, but do not themselves require to be here discussed. The persons claiming the Christian

[1] 1 Tim. vi. 14–16. [2] John v. 22, 23. [3] 1 Cor. xv. 21–25.

Digitized by Google

name who reject them are very few, and cannot be said to import any element of their own into the question as between science and Scripture; nor do they offer any better arguments for their peculiar views than such as a mere reading of the passages we have quoted is sufficient to explode. What we have to consider here are the universality of Christ's mediatorial reign as embracing all things in earth and all things relating to it, the manifestation of Deity in His person and work, and the complexion of His actings in creation and providence. Let us now attend to these three points in succession.

The universality of the mediatorial reign has reference to both space and time, or to both objects and duration. Many systematic theologians confine it to the church; regard it as strictly or entirely moral; describe it as exercised only for behoof of true Christians, or for adding to their number; and admit it to have any bearings on physical things only in so far as it controls these for good to "the elect." They speak soundly enough as far as they go; but they engender serious error by suppressing portions of truth. We hold as firmly as they do the doctrines of predestination, particular election, free grace, and special work of the Holy Spirit; but we cannot see these doctrines to repel or cross other scriptural doctrines in other spheres. Truth radiates in a million directions through the entire cube of existence; but whether it goes up or down, east or west, through the moral or through the physical, it has one source, one centre, and is all light. The intellectual forces in man, if examined strictly by themselves, might seem to be entirely isolated from the physical forces, and to have nothing in common with them; yet

Digitized by Google

the two sets of forces are both alike true, and they work together in perfect unison. The relations of the mediatorial reign to true Christians, in some analogous way, if considered completely apart from all relations of it to other men and to the physical world, might seem not to admit of their existence; yet the two sets of relations are both alike true, and they vibrate together in perfect harmony. The very continuance of any amenities in the world, as enjoyable by mankind, after the fall of Adam, was due, and could have been due, only to the mediatorial reign. God is not only the preserver specially of Christians, but the preserver of all men.[1] "He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."[2] "He does good, and gives rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling men's hearts with food and gladness,"[3] as well the wicked as the righteous, as well the heathen as the Christian, all the world round. "He hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation," as regards not "the elect" only, but "all nations of men on all the face of the earth."[4] All the good things of sunshine and seasons, air and water, food and furnishings, and all the good things of vital force, intellectual vigour, moral appliance, civilizing energy, and commercial, social, and national prosperity, as well among any one class of men as among any other, are from God. "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights."[5] But how or why do the good things come? Not certainly because men deserve them, or because they obey God, but simply because the Mediator reigns.

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 10. [2] Matt. v. 45. [3] Acts xiv. 17.
[4] Acts xvii. 26. [5] Jas. i. 17.

Digitized by Google

Had men been treated according to their deserts, after they became sinners, they could have been treated only according to the broken law which declared "all the world to have become guilty before God;"[1] so that, on account of their having forsaken the truth and gone into unrighteousness, they could have received nothing but "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish."[2] But they were treated as under the mediatorial reign; all were treated as under it; and therefore they all have ever continued to experience that, for their use and well-being and happiness, "the earth is full of God's riches."[3] The very wicked enjoy life itself and all its amenities "by grace" or free favour. They enjoy these on the same ground as that on which true Christians enjoy salvation. They have power or free-will also to pervert or reject these, just as they have power or free-will to pervert or reject the provisions of the gospel. They may, and some of the heathen ones do, absurdly attempt to obtain rain or fruitful seasons by means of charms or fetishes; just as all of them may, and so many of them do, vainly attempt to obtain salvation by means of asceticisms or almsgivings. Any of them also, if they choose, can burrow and die in deep caves of their own digging, rather than walk abroad and live in God's rain and sunshine; just as such multitudes of them can and do labour and perish in efforts to obtain justification by law, rather than believe and be saved by accepting free justification by faith. Good things of every kind come alike from the mediatorial reign, and alike to all men as free agents; insomuch that all men, according to the kind and the measure in which they receive them, whether the men be heathens or Christians,

[1] Rom. iii. 19. [2] Rom. ii. 8, 9. [3] Psa. civ. 24.

Digitized by Google

must render an account "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to the gospel." [1]

The very "propitiation for sins" is, in some sense, not for the sins of Christians only, "but also for the sins of the whole world." [2] "God was in Christ," in some sense, "reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." [3] The very commission of the Christian epoch was a commission to "go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" [4] and it necessarily implied a high boon to every man; could not imply less than his temporal and mental conservation in order to his hearing the gospel; must have implied even the capability of every man to receive it; and distinctly implied that, for at least every purpose and result of the work of evangelization, the whole earth is under the mediatorial reign. The command to "go into all the world," as well as the eligibility of every man to hear the gospel, is in the commission; and, therefore, all the facilities for "the going," or all the things which can affect it, are implied. What say you also to the fact of the general resurrection? That will come upon all men; yet it can come on any, not in result of Adam's fall, but only in result of Christ's mediation. Death alone, without possibility of any recovery from it in any way, was by Adam; and the resurrection will be all by Christ, both in result of His mediation and by fiat of His power. And since here is a clear effect of the mediatorial reign upon all men, why may there not be some other effects of it upon all? What say you, again, to the remarkable passage in the Epistle to the Romans—"The earnest expectation of

[1] Rom. ii. 11–16. [2] 1 John ii. 2. [3] 2 Cor. v. 19. [4] Mark xvi. 15.

Digitized by Google

the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God; for the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God; for we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they, but ourselves also, who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."[1] Most commentators, even those of the Calvinistic school, understand this to refer to the irrational animals; and not a few of them suppose it to teach either a happy resurrection of the brutes, or something similar or equivalent. If you agree so far with them as to refer it to the lower animals, you may do as you like with the inferences they draw from it; but do you not see that another inference is inevitable? The passage lies in the heart of a long, close, continuous exposition of the results of the redemptional work of Christ; and therefore, if it speak at all of the irrational animals, it speaks of them both as being now and as to be hereafter under the mediatorial reign? We do not ourselves understand it to relate to the brutes; we understand it, as read in the Greek and as read contextually, to relate to the spiritual creation or to true Christians on earth; yet what it would teach if it related to the brutes, or at least the doctrine of the subjection of the brutes to the mediatorial reign, we see to be distinctly taught in other passages. The eighth Psalm, as compared with a quotation from it in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is

[1] Rom. viii. 19-23.

Digitized by Google

directly in point. The psalm, speaking of man as made by God "a little lower than the angels, and crowned with glory and honour," says, "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet, all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas." [1] The epistle quotes part of this passage, and applies the whole of it to Christ; [2] nor only so, but applies it to Him in such a way as to sanction the inference that other passages which speak of all things being put under Christ, include all things physical as well as all things moral. Many a foolish flourish has been made about man being "the lord of the creation." Persons who make that flourish are thinking about their own puny selves; but they may learn from Scripture that "the man" who has dominion over the lower animals and over the rest of God's works on earth is Christ—that He is "lord of all"—that mankind have any power or place in creation only as they are under Him—that "the loftiness of men shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of men shall be made low, and the Lord alone shall be exalted." [3] Mark, too, that the eighth Psalm, while proved by the New Testament quotation from it to refer to Christ, both begins and ends with the exclamation, "O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth!" Hence do we see great significance in such passages as the following:—Jesus said to His disciples, "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered." [4] "The Lord

[1] Psa. viii. 5–8. [2] Heb. ii. 6–9. [3] Isa. ii. 17. [4] Matt. x. 29, 30.

Digitized by Google

giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens which cry."[1] "The eyes of all wait upon Thee, and Thou givest them their meat in due season; Thou openest Thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing."[2]

The time of the commencement of the mediatorial reign has been variously estimated. Some systematic theologians, as to its main results, date it no earlier than the day of Pentecost, or the day of the ascension, the resurrection, or the death of Christ; most, as to any of its results, date it from the day of the giving of the first promise to fallen Adam; and scarcely any, as to any view of it, date it from creation. All these, however, contemplate the reign as having only moral results, and if pressed to take into account such physical subordinations or connexions as even themselves admit, might be induced to modify their opinion. Some of them suppose the very moral results to have been so limited before the actual making of atonement, that all good men of the previous periods were shut up in a sort of limbo till the death or resurrection of Christ should set them free; and nearly all the rest suppose that the moral results, in some respect or other, did not begin to be fully realizable till the day of Pentecost. No doubt, revelation was far less full before than after the coming of Christ; the work of the Holy Spirit among men was far less extensive; and the aggregate of true worshippers of God, in any one generation, was far less numerous. Nevertheless, the moral results of the mediatorial reign, though correspondingly less extensive, were not less real. No doubt, also, the fact of Christ's sacrifice followed His incarnation, the fact of His

[1] Psa. cxlvii. 9. [2] Psa. cxlv. 15, 16.

Digitized by Google

ascension followed His death and resurrection, and the fact of His enthronement as High-priest and King followed His ascension. Yet the power, the virtue, the moral results of them went as truly backward as forward. Abel was saved by faith in Christ as surely as any person in the apostolic times;[1] Enoch, by faith in Christ, "was translated that he should not see death; . . . and before his translation had this testimony, that he pleased God;"[2] Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were so pre-eminently saved by faith in Christ that the "many" who were to "come from the east and west," from heathenism to Christianity, in and after the times of the apostles, were to "sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven;"[3] and the entire multitude of true worshippers from Abel or from Adam on to the apostolic times and after were one "whole family in heaven and earth," all named of "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."[4] The mediatorial reign, therefore, as to the reality and completeness of its moral results, was the same from the beginning that it is now, or dated truly from at least the time of Abel. And as to its physical relations, even the narrowest systematic theologians, who think only of its bringing salvation to "the elect," must admit that these extended back to at least the preparing or fitting of the mineral and organic world for the purposes of the moral dispensation. They, in fact, though not in form, do admit this. They say, with the Scriptures, that "all things are ours," "the world" among the rest, as we are Christ's and as Christ is God's;[5] that "all things," including of course the physical as well as the moral, "work together for good to them that love God, to them

[1] Heb. xi. 4. [2] Heb. xi. 5. [3] Matt. viii. 11.
[4] Eph. iii. 14, 15. [5] 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23.

Digitized by Google

who are the called according to His purpose;[1] and that, as a fact made known in revelation for the moral teaching of Christians, "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day."[2] Let them be allowed to reckon the time of the special creations, or successive cosmical formations, by the Lord Christ, as six calendar days; and they virtually make no objection, or even will almost formally concur. What startles them is the demand made by geology, that the six days shall be understood as six long epochs. They forget that the word "day" often occurs in Scripture in the sense of a long epoch; that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day;"[3] that duration is nothing with God; that any number or extent of successions of time with Him is a perpetual now; that the principle of a cosmical preparation through six calendar days is, in all respects, the same as the principle of a cosmical preparation through any conceivable length of epochs. They admit that principle; they admit at once the facts of cosmical preparation, the serial character of it, and the nullity of duration with God; and they, therefore, ought to have no difficulty about geological time.

Many of them, nevertheless, have great difficulty about it. Some of them, perhaps, would have courage to face the notion of two or three thousand years; but they are appalled to be told by geologists about myriads or even millions of years. They are as unable to rise to the idea of vastness of time as the theologians of the dark ages were unable to rise to the idea of vastness of space. They would confine the past duration

[1] Rom. viii. 28. [2] Exod. xx. 11. [3] 2 Peter iii. 8.

Digitized by Google

of the universe to a few thousands of years, just as the theological opponents of Galileo would have confined the extent of it to a central earth with circumvolving sun and stars. Yet we must say on their behalf that, as regards our world, they have been unnecessarily startled, in degree at least, by the computations of geologists. These computations all start from data as to the present rate of observed geognostic changes in the world, and they consequently run into enormous exaggerations. They take no account of the present state of the earth being a completed state; they ignore the fact that no special creations have occurred since the creation of man; they overlook the strong presumptive evidence afforded by that fact, that the progress of change since the appearance of man has been comparatively quiescent, or all of a character belonging to a state of completeness; they either put out of view or exceedingly underestimate the enormous areas of upheaval and the great igneous convulsions which lie recorded in the rocks; and they exclude all allowance for the intensity of heat, and the corresponding intensity of other chemical forces, in accelerating changes throughout the early epochs. Let these things be duly considered, and they will show that the velocity of transmutation was vastly greater in the times before man's creation than it is now, and that, consequently, the computations of time put forth by geologists are exceedingly overcharged. Nor have even computations relating to formations within the human period been free from prodigious error. One computation, for example, puts together several separate observations made at different places in the alluvial deposits of the Nile in Egypt, compares them with the fact of a piece of pottery

Digitized by Google

found there at a certain depth, and goes boldly to the conclusion that men existed 11,517 years before the Christian era; but is confronted and exploded by the fact that pieces of Roman pottery have been found in the same locality at even a greater depth. Many kindred errors have been detected or more or less thoroughly exposed; and they shake all faith in the very data on which the geological reckonings are raised. The duration of the world from the primal creation, or even from the creation of the first animals till the creation of man, cannot be ascertained. We can only form a very wide estimate of it; we can do no more than gather, from the successive strata of rocks, and from the successive organic creations in the strata, that it must have been very long; yet, if we give any attention to the lithology and the thickness of the strata and to the ascending order and the vast numbers of species in the special creations, we cannot fail to see a stupendous magnificence, a most wonderful gloriousness, an infinitely powerful, wise, and beneficent working in the long and manifold preparation of the physical world for Messiah's moral administration.

The future duration of the world, whether in itself or in the mediatorial reign over it, also is unknown. Scientific men can say nothing respecting it. They neither see anything in the world to show how or when it began, nor see anything in it to indicate when or how it will end. They observe it to be all in constant mutation; they suppose that its materials and forces are incessantly running in circles of interchange, without any capacity of diminution; they therefore cannot say either what shape it may hereafter assume, or whether it will come to an end at all; yet, excepting the materialistic

Digitized by Google

ones, they admit that, by the same Divine power which made it out of nothing, it can be reduced back to nothing. Revelation says three things respecting its future—that it will be the scene of universal righteousness for a thousand years, that it will be eventually destroyed by fervent heat, and that the mediatorial reign over it will cease. The thousand years are mentioned in the prophetic visions of John;[1] and, as to the state of universal knowledge and peace and purity which shall characterize them, are described both there and in the prophecies of Isaiah,[2] in the book of Psalms,[3] in the prophecies of Zechariah,[4] and in other places. The order of things then will be pre-eminently the triumph and power of Christian truth in the hearts of all men; but it will also affect the physical conditions of human life, the conditions of the lower animals, and some physical phases of the inanimate world; and yet it will not be unaccordant with anything which science has to say. The mediatorial reign during the thousand years will realize all, and vastly more than all, which the most intelligent of scientific men have desiderated as to the possible progress of civilization. The years, too, are prophetic years, and, if understood according to the rule which is applied to all other prophetic years, must be understood as three hundred and sixty thousands years. The rule is found in the passage which says, "I have appointed thee each day for a year,"[5] and it is verified by the historic rendering of the seventy weeks, the seven weeks, the threescore and two weeks, and the one week of the prophecies of Daniel.[6] Commentators and syste-

[1] Rev. xx. 2–7. [2] Isa. xi. 1–9, lxv. 17–25.
[3] Psa. ii. 8, xxii. 27, lxxii. 8–19. [4] Zech. xiv. 20, 21. [5] Ezek. iv. 6.
[6] Dan. ix. 24–27.

Digitized by Google

matic theologians apply it promptly to all other prophetic numbers in the Bible; and why do they hesitate to apply it also to the thousand years? Simply because it would make the period to be so very long! They are in the same strait here as when asked to look at geological time. They cannot so lift the eye backward as to see a very long course of most glorious evolution in the physical world, preparatory to Messiah's moral administration; and they cannot so lift the eye forward as to see a three hundred and sixty thousand years' course of universal, perfectly triumphant, surpassingly glorious results of that administration itself. Yet the long time of the geological record is demonstrably true; the long time of the physical preparation anterior to the creation of man might warrant a presumption that a vastly longer duration than a few thousand years will extend over the state of things for which the preparation was made; and the long time of three hundred and sixty thousand years, if simple consistency be observed in the rendering of prophetic numbers, will stand proved on the commentators' and the theologians' own showing. A difficulty to belief in so long a period, indeed, appears in such a computable vast increase of population, as would be more than the world could sustain; but that difficulty may be regarded as vanishing in view of the greatly altered and highly ameliorated conditions of physical life.

The destruction of the world is foretold as follows: "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall

Digitized by Google

be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."[1] "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of Thine hand: they shall perish, but Thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt Thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail."[2] The phenomena appear to be, not annihilation, but thorough transmutation; they are described as change, folding up, burning up, melting, and dissolution; they consist in the action of fire and of fervent heat, followed by a passing away with a great noise; and they involve the destruction of the present earth and its heavens, in antecedence of "new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." They all accord exactly with what is known respecting the constitution of the world and the mode of chemical action. Fire and fervent heat, raised to sufficient intensity, will resolve the entire earth into gas; and the sudden resolution of any considerable quantity of solid matter into gas constitutes an explosion, or makes the quondam solid matter "pass away with a great noise." Nor would the phenomena be unaccordant with the notions of astronomers; but, on the contrary, they would harmonize with opinions which some of the ablest of them have advanced, respecting a supposed quondam great planet between the orbit

[1] 2 Pet. iii. 10-31. [2] Heb. i. 10-12.

Digitized by Google

of Mars and that of Jupiter, and respecting nebulous matter and the disappearance of some stars. The ascription of the event to Christ, also, accords perfectly with the Bible's account of creation and providence. As He made the world, rules over it, and has it all under His mediatorial reign, so He will dissolve it when His mediatorial reign shall be completed.

The end of the mediatorial reign is announced as follows: "Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For He hath put all things under His feet. But when He saith all things are put under Him, it is manifest that He is excepted who did put all things under Him. And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all."[1] Not a word of this is intelligible, except on the doctrine that the world is under the mediatorial reign; but all is clear and pointed when that doctrine is received and understood. The world, as to everything which it is, and everything which it contains, is a "kingdom" held by the Son; it is a kingdom put under Him by the Father, for "putting down all rule and all authority and power;" it is a kingdom which must be ruled by the Son, till He shall have "put all enemies under His feet," and shall have destroyed the last enemy, death; it is a kingdom under manifestations of Deity, as in and through or by the Son; and, on the completion of all its purposes, it shall be "delivered up to God, even

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 24–28.

Digitized by Google

the Father," and the mediatorial ruler of it, as ruler, "shall also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all." Any correct view of it, or indeed any view at all, leads us on to a consideration of the manifestations of Deity in the person and work of the Son, and of the completion of the Son's actings in creation and providence.

The Deity is revealed as three hypostases and one pneuma, or three persons and one being.[1] He is manifested as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and as one God.[2] His principal designation in the Hebrew Bible, the designation rendered by the word "God," is in the plural number, and is construed always with a singular verb, and sometimes with plural adjuncts. Thus we read: "In the beginning God [plural] created [singular] the heaven and the earth."[3] "God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."[4] "The Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil."[5] "The Lord said, Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language."[6] "I heard the voice of the Lord saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?"[7] But, as shown by the passages which we formerly quoted in continuous paragraph, the manifestation of Deity to man, the manifestation of the three-one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is made in the person and work of the Son. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."[8] "No man knoweth who the Son is but the Father, and who the Father is but the Son, and He to

[1] Heb. i. 3; John xiv. 2.
[2] Matt. xxviii. 19; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; Eph. iv. 4–6; Deut. vi. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 5.
[3] Gen. i. 1. [4] Gen. i. 26. [5] Gen. iii. 22.
[6] Gen. xi. 7. [7] Isa. vi. 8. [8] John i. 18.

Digitized by Google

whom the Son will reveal Him."[1] "Jesus, when He was baptized, went up straightway out of the water; and, lo, the heavens were opened unto Him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon Him; and lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."[2] "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will?"[3] These latter passages may be thought to refer mainly to the moral administration; but other passages, formerly quoted, refer expressly to entire manifestation of Deity, or to government of all things. Christ, as we have seen, is revealed not only as the Church's priest and king, but as the world's creator and lord, as having made all things, as upholding all things, as King of kings and Lord of lords. And He manifests "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," as well over the world's physical affairs as over the Church's moral ones; as well over all its affairs of creation and providence, as over its affairs of moral government.

Yet He does not manifest Himself in separate personality, but manifests the Godhead—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. He says, "I and my Father are one."[4] "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."[5] "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do; for what things soever He doeth, these also

[1] Luke x. 22.
[2] Matt. iii. 16, 17; Mark i. 10, 11; Luke iii. 21, 22; John i. 32.
[3] Heb. ii. 3, 4. [4] John x. 30. [5] John v. 17.

Digitized by Google

doeth the Son likewise."[1] "I seek not Mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent Me."[2] "Father, I have glorified Thee on the earth; I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do."[3] "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, neither knoweth Him."[4] "The Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."[5] "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, He shall testify of Me."[6] "When He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak, and He will shew you things to come. He shall glorify Me; for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are Mine; therefore said I, that He shall take of Mine, and shall shew it unto you."[7] These passages show both that God is manifested in Christ, and that He is manifested as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Multitudes of other passages concur with them in general doctrine; and when these multitudes of passages are read collectively, or even when some of them are read individually or two by two, they are found to teach that, in the mediatorial manifestation of Deity, the Father sent the Son, the Son was sent by the Father, and the Holy Spirit was sent by the Father and the Son, and that the Father forgives sin, the Son redeems from sin, and the Holy

[1] John v. 19. [2] John v. 30. [3] John xvii. 4. [4] John xiv. 16, 17. [5] John xiv. 26. [6] John xv. 26. [7] John xvi. 13–15.

Digitized by Google

Spirit regenerates the sinner. Hence, in parallelism to them, both Christ and His apostles teach that prayer is to be made in His name, and that the preaching of the gospel, with all the blessings involved it, is to be done in His name;[1] and thus they show us that the reign or kingdom of God on earth is the reign or kingdom of the Mediator; but they teach us also that the prayer is to be offered to the Father, and that the power of the preaching is by the Holy Spirit;[2] and thus they show us that the mediatorial reign is a manifestation of the Godhead—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. These passages also may be thought to refer mainly to the moral administration; but they necessarily cover the government of physical things as included in or under the government of the moral. Nor only so, but they are necessarily concurrent with the numerous other passages which speak expressly of creation and providence. Nor merely that; but some of the most striking passages on the manifestation of Deity to man, such as those in the Epistles to the Hebrews, the Colossians, and the Ephesians, speak mingledly or conjointly of creation, providence, and redemption. Hence does the aggregate teaching of Scripture, on the one hand, represent the entire manifestation of Deity in our world, in all respects, as made in the person and work of Christ, and, on the other hand, speak of God as God, in the several relations of creator, providential ruler, moral governor and judge, and speak severally of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in relation to various dispensations and works.[3]

[1] John xiv. 13, 14; Heb. x. 19, 20; Matt. xxviii. 20; Acts iv. 12.

[2] John xv. 16; Matt. vi. 9; Eph. iii. 14; Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 8; 1 Cor. ii. 4; 1 Thess. i. 5.

[3] Heb. i. 1, 2; Matt. v. 48, vii. 11, vi. 11; John v. 21; Gen. i. 2; Exod. xxxi. 1–11; Zech. iv. 6; 2 Pet. i. 21; 1 Cor. ii. 13; Heb. ii. 4; Acts ii. 14–21.

Digitized by Google

The characteristic name of Deity as manifested in Christ is Jehovah. This name is Hebrew, and occurs only in the Old Testament. It appears in only a few passages in the English translation; but it is in all the places, nearly seven hundred in number, where our translation has the word LORD in capital letters. It is represented in the New Testament by a Greek word which is translated variously "lord," "master," and "sir," and which has in itself the meanings of all these words, but which, as often applied to Christ or to God as manifested in Christ, has contextually the same meaning as the word Jehovah. This name, as regards its etymology, cannot be better rendered than by the phrase, "He who is and who was and who is to come;" and in the form of that phrase, following the word "Lord," and followed by the words "the Almighty," it is applied by Christ to Himself in the introduction to His message to the seven churches in Asia.[1] It is also constructively applied to Him by the Father in the quotation from the 102nd Psalm in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "Thou, Lord," constructively Jehovah, "in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth."[2] It is likewise applied to Him in the numerous places of the Old Testament which contain, in the English version, the words, "the angel of the Lord," or "an angel of the Lord." These words represent two Hebrew nouns in apposition—not, indeed, according to the Masoretic points, which were a late and entirely human innovation, but in the pure or proper Hebrew itself; and they require to be read, "the Angel—Jehovah." "Angel" is "messenger," or "sent one"; "the angel" is "the one sent by God;" and "the Angel-Jehovah" is "the Divine messenger sent

[1] Rev. i. 8. [2] Heb. i. 10.

Digitized by Google

by the Father," the same as "the messenger of the covenant."[1] The name Angel-Jehovah, too, is used interchangeably in several passages with the names Jehovah and God.[2] The import of the name Jehovah, therefore, as seen in the Bible's own light, cannot be mistaken. The name designates either the Mediator Himself, or the Deity as manifested in the Mediator. It has a special significance, as distinguished from the name God. That name is specially expressive of the omnipotence of Deity, or is closely akin to the name the Almighty, and is used distinctively with reference to works of creation, to great works of providence, or to any other works as simply Divine. The name Jehovah, on the other hand, has special reference to the mediatorial reign; and, as the main revealed or recorded facts of that reign, have relation to the redemption of man by the Son of God's incarnation, priesthood, and kingship, it is commonly used in connexion with the statement of these facts, or of results flowing from them, either as anticipated, as prefigured, or as foretold.

But some cold critics treat the two names as strictly synonymous. They imagine them to have no difference in either import or application. They suppose that, out of mere caprice or fancy, some writers chose to use the one name, and some to use the other; they allege that various writers penned various parts of the Pentateuch, and that these various parts were eventually collected together into continuous form; they collocate the parts *containing* the word God or Elohim as parts penned by one set of writers, and the parts *containing* the word

[1] Mal. iii. 1.

[2] Gen. xvi. 7–13, xxii. 11–18; Exod. iii. 2–18; Judges vi. 11–27, xiii. 2–22.

Digitized by Google

Jehovah as parts penned by another set of writers; they then compare what they call the Elohistic parts with what they call the Jehovaistic parts; they proceed to make discoveries that in several details the two parts do not agree, and they finish with a bold inference adverse to the inspiration of the Bible. They really, however, do nothing more than display their own ignorance and folly. They, of course, have not a shadow of ground for their assumption; they simply make a vicious circle by commencing with alleged inexactitude in the use of the words God and Jehovah, and reasoning from that to alleged inexactitude in the narratives; and they also disagree among themselves as to both the collocations and the alleged discrepancies of the two sets of passages, and confute one another by their conflicting conclusions. Had they read the Bible in its own light, they might have been put right, or rather prevented from going wrong, by the very first instance of what they call the Elohistic and the Jehovaistic narratives. That instance consists of a reading with the word God from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the third verse of the second chapter, and a reading with the word Jehovah throughout the rest of the second chapter; and it is criticised by them especially as to what it says respecting the creation of man. Now the slightest attention is sufficient for seeing that the Elohistic part relates to the exercise of Divine power, while the Jehovaistic part relates to the exercise of the Divine moral government, or that the former speaks of man simply as a creature, while the latter speaks of him in those relations which, according to the Divine foreknowledge, were to issue in his need of redemption by Christ.

Digitized by Google

One passage speaks emphatically respecting the name Jehovah, and throws a stream of light upon its meaning; yet, besides being misused by adverse critics, has not always been understood by friendly theologians. That passage relates to the mission of Moses to deliver the Israelites from Egypt and lead them to Canaan, and it says, "God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am Jehovah; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by My name Jehovah was I not known to them." [1] Every misconstruction and every difficulty here have turned upon the word "name." The passage has been read as if "name" meant merely "appellation;" and then it has been made to conflict with other passages, which show that the appellation Jehovah was known not only to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but to men from the beginning. Yet what is plainer in the Bible than a current meaning of the word "name" widely different from mere appellation? Read the four hundred passages or more in which that word occurs, and you will find all of them which refer to God, and the great majority of the whole, to employ "name" in the sense of power, manifestation, glory, or a work done by which character is made known. Mark that to be the meaning of the word, and you then understand the announcement to Moses to have been that, by His power, manifestation, or work done as Jehovah, God was not known to the patriarchs. The context explains it. The covenant which God established with them was to be a typical constitution, emblematic of the scheme of man's redemption. The Israelites were to be the types of redeemed men, both in earth and in heaven; they were

[1] Exod. vi. 2–8.

Digitized by Google

to possess the land of Canaan as the type of the church's inheritance, both here and hereafter; and they were to hold it under the direct administration of God, under defence by Him against all enemies, and with the ritualistic ordinances of His worship in the midst of it, as types of the church's continual enjoyment of the kingship and priesthood of Christ. Here were the central truths in the revelation of the Deity as Jehovah; the central truths in the manifestation of Deity in Christ; the central truths connected with the mediatorial reign. They were here, indeed, to be exhibited or taught in a typical or symbolical manner; but they were truths notwithstanding, and they would in due time, after the incarnation of Christ, be taught literally and plainly. Now the covenant or constitution embodying them was only promised to the patriarchs; it was not accomplished to them; it had lain over in simple promise till this very time of the commission to Moses; and it was to be brought into accomplishment by the very means of his executing that commission. Hence are there three things in the announcement to Moses—first, the statement that, by His work done as Jehovah, God was not known to the patriarchs; next, a statement respecting His covenant with them, that He was "to give them the land of Canaan;" next, this message to the Children of Israel, "Say unto them, I am Jehovah, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will redeem you with a stretched-out arm and with great judgments; and I will take you to Me for a people, and I will be to you a God, and ye shall know that I am Jehovah your God, who bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians; and I will bring you in unto the land concerning the which I did

Digitized by Google

swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, and I will give it you for an heritage; I am Jehovah." We accordingly find mention of Jehovah in all the subsequent covenant history of the Hebrew people, and find corresponding mention of Jehovah in the numerous prophecies which describe the church of Christ till the end of time, and the church of Christ in heaven, under the emblem of the Hebrew commonwealth, or of Canaan, Jerusalem, and the temple.

Jehovah is God as manifested in Christ; and therefore Jehovah was God as manifested to the people of the typical covenant, is God as manifested to the people of the spiritual covenant, is God as manifested to the whole earth. The passages which speak of Jehovah in reference to the church, either typical or spiritual, are so exceedingly numerous that they could not be quoted within available limits; and moreover, have been so freely interwoven with all fair theological teaching, that they scarcely need to be quoted. Even the passages which speak of Jehovah with more general reference are not few, but have seldom been quoted in any other than a dogmatic connexion. Specimens of these passages are the following:—"Moses said unto him, As soon as I am gone out of the city, I will spread abroad my hands unto Jehovah, and the thunder shall cease, neither shall there be any more hail, that thou mayest know how that the earth is Jehovah's."[1] "The earth is Jehovah's, and the fulness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein; for He hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods."[2] "Jehovah thundered in the heavens, and the Highest gave His voice, hailstones and coals of fire; yea, He sent out His arrows, and scattered them,

[1] Exod. ix 29. [2] Psa. xxiv. 1, 2.

Digitized by Google

and He shot out lightnings and discomfited them; then the channels of water were seen, and the foundations of the world were discovered at thy rebuke, O Jehovah, at the blast of the breath of Thy nostrils." [1] "I am Jehovah, and there is none else; there is no God besides Me; I girded thee, though thou hast not known Me; that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside Me. I am Jehovah and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I Jehovah do all these things." [2] "Then shall Jehovah go forth, and fight against those nations, as when He fought in the day of battle." [3] "Why leap ye, ye high hills? this is the hill which God desireth to dwell in; yea, Jehovah will dwell in it for ever. The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels; the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that Jehovah God might dwell among them." [4]

We are now led to consider the complexions of the actings of Jehovah, manifested Deity, the Son of God, in creation and providence. This, in as far as it relates to the periods of time prior to the creation of man, is a subject on which we have little light. The very present condition of the world, in its relations to the Creator and Divine Governor, would have been little known to us without revelation. The ancient philosophers, notwithstanding all their astuteness, and notwithstanding important aids afforded to them by gleams of light from the patriarchal and the Hebrew revelations, never were

[1] Psa. xviii. 13–15. [2] Isa. xlv. 5–7. [3] Zech. xiv. 3.
[4] Psa. lxviii. 16–18.

Digitized by Google

able to acquire any tolerable notion of either the world's origin or the manner in which the Creator governs it. They might have known readily "the eternal power and Godhead" of the Deity; but they were blinded by the perverting influence of sin on their mind; they became sheer fools in their very efforts, many and long and elaborate, to become wise; and they worked out no better a philosophy of the earth and its government than a wild, weak, ridiculous, and bewildering mythology. Modern savants could only have worked out something similar, or something as bad, except for light from the Bible. Many of them, indeed, boast of what they call "pure science," make no acknowledgment to the Bible, and even formally repudiate it; but they, nevertheless, acquired from it both the elements of all their best knowledge, and the strongest bracings of intellect for pursuing their investigations; and whenever they neglect it, or in so far as they depart from it, they inevitably go, as we saw in our first chapter, into the same sort of absurdity which pervaded the cosmogonies of the ancients. All men who possess any tolerable knowledge of the world, in its relations to God, undoubtedly owe it, either directly or indirectly, to the Bible. But the Bible says very little respecting the time from the primal creation till the creation of man; and no other revelation exists to say anything respecting it. Even geology, which professes to have discovered a great new book, all on the history of that time, and to have laid open the great new book page by page for our perusal, really adds not one element to our knowledge of moral government. It adds very largely and gloriously to our knowledge of those special creations, those wonderful organizations, those rich displays of Divine power and wisdom and

Digitized by Google

beneficence, of which we have intimations in the Bible; but it adds nothing to our knowledge of how they were formed, how they were governed, or in what relations they stood to the mediatorial reign. Had geology been known to the ancient philosophers, it would not have made them one whit wiser. Hence, with only geology and the intimations in the Bible to instruct us, our acquaintance with the time from the primal creation till the creation of man must always be exceedingly circumscribed. Yet very small as this knowledge is, it includes a notion or two respecting the condition of the lower animals, and some important notions respecting the preparation of the world for the time of man.

The many successive kinds of plants and the many successive races of animals which came into being, flourished for an epoch or two, and passed into extinction before the creation of man, were all as wonderfully organized as any which exist now. Each was a world of wonders in itself, and each co-operated at a multitude of points with thousands of worlds of wonders around it. Whatever can be said, for purposes of edification and devotion, about any plant or animal of the present day, may be said about any extinct plant or animal found fossilized in the rocks. What moral purposes the extinct organic beings served in their respective periods, we cannot know; whether purposes may not have been served by them beneficial to possible moral contemporaries who have passed away, or beneficial to possible angel visitants from other spheres, we can neither conjecture nor deny; but what moral purposes they may serve to man now, as they come out to his view in geological research, we can very distinctly see. They can teach man substantially everything which, as shown

Digitized by Google

in the Bible, is taught by the present lilies, ants, hippopotami, and crocodiles, or by any other extant plants and animals; and as they come out to view, in their successive creations, exhibiting a continuous stream of glory from the Creator through the long epochs before there was a man on the earth, they are fitted also to rouse all our previous devotions into higher strains of expression, to help our minds outward and upward into grander expansions of thought respecting the spaces and the durations of the Divine working, and to push our anticipations forward, strongly and fervently, to a long continuance of moral glory of the mediatorial reign in the future, corresponding to the long continuance of physical glory in the past. The extinct animals, especially, afford most voluminous lessons to at once the imagination, the judgment, and the moral sense of man. The geological discovery of the animal fossils in the rocks was practically like a Divine gift to the church of a great new book of psalms. God foresaw that the discovery should be made; He ordained that it should be made; He created all the animals and lodged their remains in the rocks, as the material on which it should be made; and did He mean less, by His preparations for it and by the actual occurrence of it, than to instruct His people, to inspirit their devotions, and to emit a new call to all mankind to know and adore and serve Him as "the everlasting God, Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth"?[1] All the wonders of human invention and art, of every age and country, if all were concentrated into one view, are as nothing compared with the wonders of a few of the fossils. The very smallest and simplest of the fossils are a study. The

[1] Isa. xl. 28.

Digitized by Google

modes in which even the radiates must have lived, the modes in which their organization must have been built up, the modes in which they must have subsisted, the modes in which they must have reciprocated functions with multitudes of both inorganic and organic things around them, and the modes in which they severally played a part, both in life and after death, for the uses of many races of many kinds of beings after them, and eminently for the uses of the human race under the administration of the scheme of redemption, present a very cyclopædia of thought to a mere reflecting man, and much more to a Christian. Then, pass upward through the long ranges of special creation after special creation till you reach the beginnings of the animals which now exist; pass laterally also through the thousands of species contemporary with one another, in each of the successive epochs; try to trace the organization, the habits, and the co-operations of the several races and species, each within its own time; try further to trace the enormously accumulating relations, of preparation or of fitness, which all had successively and aggregately to everything which was to follow, on to the end of time; and you will find yourself a mere child in the midst of a library more extensive and various than a city, and unfolding to you such a mass of instruction as you can more readily gaze at than learn. And all that instruction, either when viewed in the bulk or when examined in detail, is replete with the comprehensive lesson, "The earth is Jehovah's, and the fulness thereof."

But why were the animals subject to death? A difficulty, no doubt, is there; but it entirely arises either from our not taking into account all the facts respecting them which are known to us, or from our ignorance of

Digitized by Google

possible other facts belonging to their constitution, or of possible other circumstances which may have affected them. First, organization, simply as organization, apart from some conservative force superinduced upon it, necessarily involves dissolution. Either there could have been no organization at all, or some force different from any known to exist now must have been superinduced upon it to preserve it from decay, or it must have inevitably, in every individual, worn itself out in death. A superinduced conservative force seems evidently to have been given in the case of Adam in paradise, and probably was connected with his use of "the tree of life in the midst of the garden;" but it appears to have been peculiar to man in his state of innocence, and was lost by him at his fall. Even man thenceforth, when expelled from the garden, when he could no longer "put forth his hand and take of the tree of life and eat and live for ever," became subject to death;[1] and no other animal seems to have ever enjoyed any superinduced conservative force in its organization. Next, the limitation of space and food for the several species necessarily involved a limitation of life. Had not life been limited, the total number of species could not have had scope for even a short existence, and any two or three species, especially of the larger kind, would have been sufficient eventually to fill the world, and would, even then, have arrived at a condition obliging them to die. Again, the balance of forces among the several species, or the equipoise of place and provision for their severally obtaining food, necessarily involved such a constant check against the over-multiplication of every one species as should keep it within the proportions of its own place

[1] Gen. iii. 22–24.

Digitized by Google

for supplies of sustenance. Had no such check been in operation from the first, to maintain an equipoise from the beginning, something like it, in a much more sweeping form, must have eventually arisen. Any one species, especially one of the larger kinds, if it had progressed and multiplied immortally, would soon, by its monopoly of place and food, have brought mortality upon all the rest. The establishing of dissolution as a condition of organization was simply a provision for maintaining the myriad kinds of organic beings in a state of commonwealth. Again, the structure and functions and instincts of every species were so wonderfully, so perfectly, so infinitesimally adapted to happiness, through all the successive moments of the entire life, as to render eventual death, at the most, little else than mere extinction. Death, as to either pain or any other comfortless preliminary of it, did not run through the system of any creature's life, but came bodily at the close. The life, all through, was perfectly equipped for happiness, perfectly furnished with every appliance for good, perfectly defended against every inlet of discomfort, and only went out at the end. The very complexity and intricacy and surpassing beauty of the organic provision for the halcyon enjoyment of every animal, from the minutest to the largest, is one of the most exquisite lessons in the book of the fossiliferous rocks. Again, the predaceous system in the interdependence of the species, whereby a large animal preyed upon a small one and a small one preyed upon a smaller, while it operated both to circulate the supplies of food and to check the over-multiplication of numbers, or to maintain the equipoise throughout the commonwealth, operated also to prevent the forms of death which issue from

Digitized by Google

decay, disease, and prolonged suffering. These are the forms of it which men mainly dread—the forms of it with which all their notions of it are associated—forms, not so much or at all of extinction of life, as of sharp suffering and bitter agony; but they were forms of it expressly averted from the now extinct animals by the predaceous system. The animals, for the most part, met death at once, with scarcely a pang; passed almost instantaneously from complete enjoyment into complete extinction. Further, the igneous convulsions of the old geognostic times—the great upheavals, eruptions, and displacements which frequently tossed great breadths of both sea and land—operated, for all species, in the same way as the predaceous system did for the preys. These things brought death instantaneously, without an instant's struggle; and some of them have left their effects most distinctly in the rocks, in shoals of creatures lying fossilized there in the attitudes in which they were struck. Further, the possible existence of some analogy between the life system over the lower animals and the moral system over man, might explain much which we cannot at present know. The vital principle, the instincts, the mind of the lower animals are known to us only as playing through their organisms; they cannot be gauged by our personal consciousness, as the intellect of our fellow-men is gauged by it; they possibly have some peculiar function or relation not discernible by us; and they may, through such function or relation, render death to the animals considerably different in character from what we pronounce it to be. You may call this notion fanciful, if you like; but you will admit, at least, that it is within the limits of possibility. Further, a possible connexion between the display of God's glory

Digitized by Google

in the animal economy of our world and the promotion of the moral well-being of intelligent creatures in other worlds, might afford additional explanation. Such a connexion certainly exists in regard to the church, insomuch that, by the church, is made known the manifold wisdom of God "to the principalities and powers in heavenly places;"[1] and some analogous connexion, though on a lower scale, may possibly have always existed in regard to the lower animals, and may have been such as to give some important complexion, not more manifestly to their wonderful organizations and instincts, than to their death. You may call this notion also fanciful, if you choose; but you will admit, at least, that it also is within the limits of possibility. Finally, a possible beneficent influence may have pervaded any amount of real suffering which, in any case, preceded the death of the pre-Adamite animals, analogous to the highly beneficent influence which certainly pervades, or is ever ready to pervade, the sufferings of men. So exalted is this influence on the part of Christians that all their affliction in the world is "light and but for a moment," and "works for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory;"[2] so uniformly good and great is it as to be the topic of much teaching toward gratitude and joy, in many passages of the Bible; and some influence analogous to it, if not for "glory" after death, at least for exquisiteness of sensation in death itself, may not impossibly have played through the frame of any of the few ancient animals which really had any suffering. You may perhaps think it degrading to the church to suppose any possible analogy, in any matter, between it and the lower animals. What then do you

[1] Eph. iii. 10. [2] 2 Cor. iv. 17.

Digitized by Google

say to the argument for the Christian duty of supporting Christian ministers, "Doth God take care for oxen?"[1] These considerations, taken collectively, appear to solve completely the difficulty respecting the death of the ancient animals; nor only so, but they appear also to bring into the place of the difficulty a direct and striking illustration, additional to the gorgeous assemblage of other illustrations, of the Divine wisdom and goodness which lay enstamped on everything in the old world.

The preparation of the earth, from the primal creation onward, for the times of man, is so obvious as to require very little remark. Mere savants, without any theology, see it clearly and descant largely on it. But the main character of it, as all under the mediatorial reign, is awanting in what they say. The Divine Wisdom says, "When Jehovah prepared the heavens, I was there; when He set a compass upon the face of the depth; when He established the clouds above; when He strengthened the fountains of the deep; when He gave to the sea His decree, that the waters should not pass His commandment; when He appointed the foundations of the earth, then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him; rejoicing in the habitable part of His earth; and my delights were with the sons of men."[2] Wisdom here is understood by some as the Divine Wisdom personified; by others, as the Son of God. Jehovah, as we have seen, is the Deity as manifested in the person and work of the Son. The preparation is preparation from the earliest epoch; the preparation onward from primal creation, through the first "day," the second "day," and part of the third

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 8–14. [2] Prov. viii. 27–31.

Digitized by Google

"day" of the first chapter of Genesis; the preparation commensurate with the merely inorganic periods of the geological record; that preparation was the basis of all the subsequent organic superstructure, both as described by Moses and as described by geologists. All of it, and of course all the superstructure on it, were done by Jehovah. All of it, and of course all that followed, also were prospective for man. The Divine Wisdom or the Son of God was over all of it and through all of it, and of course over and through all that followed, with express reference to mankind. He was "rejoicing in the habitable part of the earth," or in everything about it in the course of preparation for being inhabited; and "His delights were with the sons of men." He had then mankind, in all their successive generations, before His mind as fully as if all had then been in existence. All future periods, with all the beings in them, were before Him as a present now and as a perpetual now. He contemplated the futurities for mankind with the same "rejoicing" and the same "delights" as if the futurities had been past. He had the same thoughts respecting His ransomed ones, and respecting all the work and the means for achieving their salvation, which He will have when "He shall see of the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied."[1] "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day and for ever."[2] His workings for them, stage after stage, through all the long series of preparation of the earth from the primal creation onward, were all done with the conditions and needs of every man, through every moment and down to the minutest thing, completely before His view.

[1] Isa. liii. 11. [2] Heb. xiii. 8.

Digitized by Google

To trace the details of the preparation of the earth for man would fill volumes. The preparation went on in the inorganic mineral actions, in the atmosphere, in the waters, in the crystalline rocks, in the soils, in the sediments, in the mutual reflux of sea and land, in the early plants, in the early animals, in the early stratified rocks, in the successive rock formations, in all the successive series of plants, in all the successive series of animals, in all the successive subsidences and upheavals of portions of the earth's surface, and in all the millions of co-operations and reciprocations of forces and of creatures till the appearance of Adam. You cannot name an existing thing in the world, from the simplest to the most complex or from the minutest to the largest, which does not carry you back through long epochs of the marvellous preparation. If you name the principal elements, oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen, sulphur, phosphorus, calcium, iron, and others, each of them will lead you away into a history which could not be well told in less than hundreds of pages. If you name some of the chief compound minerals, granite, sandstone, limestone, clay, coal, iron ores, lead ores, and others, each will carry you first through intricate crossings with the history of the elements, and next through a long and wonderful history of its own. If you name the plants, they will take you through a stupendous history of connexion, on one side with air and sunshine, on another side with water and dissolved salts, on another side with things taken from the soil and things added to it, on another side with the formations of coal and lignite and humus, on another side with changes in atmospheric and climatic conditions, on another side with the sustenance and the successions of

Digitized by Google

animals; a history so exceedingly elaborate and manifold that many large portions of it stretch away beyond our ken. If you name the animals, they spread out their skeletons before you, to show you the inexpressible beauty of the Divine workmanship in the structure of their organisms; they convey you round and round, and hither and thither, among all the histories of the elements and the compound minerals and the plants; they disclose to you gorgeous additional chapters on the preparation of the rocks and the soils; they tell you of great or useful rock substances, such as limestones, corals, flints, coprolites, and phosphates, which were evolved out of their own organisms or economy; they altogether lead you through a history still more elaborate and manifold than even that of the plants. Select only three familiar substances, coal, iron-stone, and limestone, and you will find in them more than sufficient to instruct you. First, trace their history separately, and you will be conveyed luminously back through the long past epochs; next, notice their respective positions, and you will see how they are laid down exactly to subserve best the evoking of man's intelligence and skilled labour to discover and work them; next, remark their properties, and you will discern their fine and manifold adaptations to his industry, his civilization, and his social and moral comfort; next, note that they often occur in close juxta-position to one another, and you will see that they directly stimulate and richly reward those advanced arts and sciences which radiate from the smelting furnace. Select any other substances among the thou-sands, either on the earth's surface or within its crust, and you will be led to similar results. But observe, very many of them were not used in the early human

Digitized by Google

ages; some of the richest, such as coal, were not used till comparatively modern times; some valuable ones, such as the oil-yielding bituminous shales, did not come into use till within these few years; and absolutely all, except a few on the surface, are still utterly neglected in barbarian countries. Are not these facts also instructive? Do they not show, or at least suggest, that the preparation of the earth for man had reference, not to early generations only, but to all generations? had reference to a progress of social improvement, somewhat corresponding to the progress of true religion? had reference to increase of knowledge and purity and Christian glory in the earth, from the dawn of light in the morning of the moral administration, onward to the full blaze of day in the millennium? Chemistry and physical philosophy and general science, looking only at the material world, can even now conjecture that there may soon or eventually be found appliances of lighting, of heating, of mechanical force, of artificership, of manufacturing skill, of production of food, of diffusion of knowledge, and of general well-being, so immensely superior to any which exist at present as not only to supersede them, but to cause them to be ever thenceforth regarded in the light in which we regard the rude usages and implements of savages tribes. When these things shall be realized, they will be completely harmonious with the Bible's descriptive predictions of the millennial period, and they will come out in grand evidence that the preparation of the earth for mankind was a preparation for them till the end of time.

The complexion of the mediatorial reign toward the human ages of the world is clear, open, and glorious, vastly beyond all power of description. The record of

Digitized by Google

it is everywhere, throughout the globe, throughout literature, throughout revelation. A discussion of it would lead through all history, all science, all theology. Any attempt to sketch even the faintest outline of it would be impossible within our limits, and is not required. What alone is wanted, amid the boundless profusion of all sorts of materials upon it in all directions, is to supply defects and correct errors in history, literature, scientific statement, and dogmatic theology. But even this, to be done effectively, would involve the writing of hundreds of volumes by scores of men. A full or fair view of the complexion of the mediatorial reign toward mankind is tantamount to a full or fair view of all truth of every kind affecting men either for the present life or for eternity; and a clearing away of the observations with which that view has been clouded would be tantamount to the removal of all the errors with which the several portions of the truth have been mixed. To attempt that also would be prodigiously beyond the powers of one man. Chief things required in it would be supplies of defect and correction of error in expositions of Scripture—in statements of the cardinal doctrines respecting our Lord's person, His priesthood, His vicarious sacrifice, His intercession, His kingship, the Holy Spirit's work, the conversion of the wicked, the maturing of Christians, the constitution of the church, the ways of providence, the position of unbelievers, the relations of Christianity to political government, and the relations of the Divine administration to the lower animals—in all civil history and in the method of writing it—in all ecclesiastical history and in the method of writing it—in the teaching of every department of science—and in the theories or rules relating to every branch of educa-

Digitized by Google

tion, industry, trade, and social order. But to go over even these things with any effect, ever so slightly, is likewise obviously impossible for us. So truly immense, so literally all-pervading, so overwhelmingly magnificent are the emanations of Messiah's reign upon man, streaming through every atom, ensphering the world in the light which is inaccessible and full of glory, that any thought of converging them into miniature would be as vain as a thought of attempting to ascertain infinitude. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor? or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed unto Him again? For of Him and through Him and to Him are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen." [1]

We come now to the last topic which occurs to be noticed in our present chapter—the connexion of creation with the sabbath. That connexion is stated in the fourth commandment—"Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." [2] A reason is here given for the commandment as it was promulged from Sinai; and other reasons were afterwards given for

[1] Rom. xi. 33–36. [2] Exod. xx. 8–11.

Digitized by Google

it as repromulged or repeated at the end of the Israelites' journeyings:—"Keep the sabbath day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou; and remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day." [1] Another grand reason for it was given in the announcement of a vast doctrinal import in the sabbath, or of a magnificent didactic use to which it was continually to be put—"Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between Me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you; wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant; it is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever." [2] Other reasons also are found in the associating of the observance of the sabbath with the reverencing of the sanctuary, the offering of the sacrifices, and the keeping of the several sacred festivals.[3] And a grand comprehensive reason for the sabbath law, cumulatively with the other Divine laws, is given in the simple fact of the Divine authority—"I am the Lord thy God." [4]

[1] Deut. v. 12–15. [2] Exod. xxxi. 13–17.
[3] Lev. xix. 30; Ezek. xlv. 17; Hos. ii. 11; Isa. i. 13, lxvi. 23.
[4] Exod. xx. 2.

Digitized by Google

Now, as God's resting on the seventh day, after the six days of creation, is only one of several reasons for the sabbath, so the connexion between God's resting on the seventh day and the duty of man's resting on the sabbath appears to be only one of several things taught by the fact of God's resting. The first record of the fact says nothing respecting the Sabbath; states, nevertheless, that "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it;" and gives, as the reason for His doing so, that "in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made."[1] Two things here are placed in relation to God's resting; the one, that He made the world during six days; the other, that He blessed and sanctified the seventh day; and both, in regard to the duration which they imply, come into clear light in the immediately following statement—"These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens."[2] The time of the creation work is thus termed "the day"—one day. It was six days distributively, as regarded the several or successive portions of the work; but it was one day collectively, as regarded its relation to the subsequent period of rest. You thus learn that the word "day" means not a calendar day, not one revolution of the earth on its axis, but an epoch, an indefinite period; and if you wish to see other instances in which it has the same meaning, read Job xiv. 6, x. 25; Joel ii. 2; Zech. iv. 10; Luke xvii. 24; John xvi. 26, ix. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 2; Heb. iii. 8, iv. 7, 8; Jer. xxx. 7; Hos. i. 11; Psa. xcv. 8, cx. 3; Eccles. vii. 14; Isa. ii. 11, xix. 21, xxiv. 21; and very many other passages. Or simply advert to the ordinary usage of speech, in your ver-

[1] Gen. ii. 3. [2] Gen. ii. 4.

Digitized by Google

nacular language or in any other; and you will find the word "day," or its equivalent, often employed to designate an epoch or an indefinite period. To take it in the sense of a calendar day, in the Bible's account of creation or in its references to that account, is at once to make its mention of one day conflict with its mention of six days, to spread a pall over its narrative of the six days' work, to contradict all the findings of geology, and to reduce to little more than a faint ray the sublime glory of the announcement, that "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." Most persons who so understand it imagine that the work of creation commenced on a Sunday morning, that it ceased on the Friday evening, that the blessing and sanctifying of the seventh day was simply the instituting of the sabbath, and that the long process of our first parents' observing it in purity, of their entire life of innocence, of their enjoyment of Eden, of their dressing and keeping the garden, of their getting acquainted with all the plants and animals, of their holy fellowship with God, of their passing through the temptation and the fall, of their arraignment for their transgression, of their receiving the revelation of redemption, of their expulsion from the garden, and of their commencement of a revulsed life under the conditions of their doom, all passed over and was done before that first sabbath came to an end. Can such a farrago as that be called credible? The stupid or the deluded may believe it, but sensible men never.

The seventh "day" was an epoch, as each of the six "days" was an epoch, or as all the six collectively were an epoch; but it differed from them in not having come to an end. The record says, "The evening and the morning were the first day;" and it says correspondingly

Digitized by Google

respecting each of the five following days; but it does not say, "The evening and the morning were the seventh day." It describes each of the six days as completed; but it describes the seventh day as only begun. It marks the six collectively as "the day" of work; and it marks the seventh as the day of rest. God went on creating the world throughout the six; but He pronounced the world to be then complete; and He rested on the seventh day, "and was refreshed." [1] He saw all the work which had been done, "that it was good;" He was "satisfied with it," and "rejoiced in it;" He viewed it as requiring no further addition or development; and He looked on it with repose and complacency. All this, of course, is a speaking after the manner of men; but so is also the word "rested." The full import of that word is ceasing to work; and all that import refers backward to what had been done. The resting on the seventh day does no more than imply that no more work, in the way of creating the world, should be done; it neither implies that the seventh day came to an end, nor intimates how long it should continue. The narrative is not a narrative of one cycle of seven "days," to be followed by other cycles of seven days, or by any other cycles whatever; but it is a narrative of only one six-sectioned "day" of creation-work for good and all, and only one succeeding day of rest for good and all. And the "resting" is now as it was at the first, and will be till the end of time as it was at the first; and therefore the "seventh day" was and is and will be the epoch of the moral administration. "The day," or the collective six days, in which "the Lord God made the earth and the heavens," was the epoch of only the minerals, the

[1] Exod. xxxi. 17.

Digitized by Google

plants, and the animals ; but "the seventh day" was and is the epoch also of the human race.

"God," we are further told, "blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." He shed influences on it far different from any which he had shed on the preceding days. He bestowed upon it far higher favours, and marked it out for far higher purposes. Blessing from God, in the ordinary uses of the word, denotes moral or spiritual favours ; and sanctification by God, in the ordinary uses of the word, particularly in the Old Testament, where it often applies to things as well as to persons, denotes setting apart or consecrating to the services of Divine worship. The seventh day, or moral administration epoch, was immersed in glories peculiar to itself, and devoted to the crowning purposes of the mediatorial reign. The preparational processes in the world had all been accomplished then ; the fruition of the entire work of creation was in full fruitage then ; the splendour of the paradisaic economy over man burst forth at the outset ; the higher effulgence of the economy of redemption burst forth immediately after man's fall ; that higher effulgence ever thenceforth shone upon all men who would receive it, for "changing them from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord," till it suddenly streamed forth in great increase of power at the "rising of the Sun of Righteousness with healing in His rays ;" it will continue to shine with growing strength and widening scope till the afternoon hours or "latter day," when "the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days ;" and it will shine in that maximum of brilliance, flooding the whole earth with light and love and blessedness, through all the millennial

Digitized by Google

times. And afterwards shall come the resulting and surpassingly magnificent "sabbatism," when every portion of the import of God's assurance to his church shall be realized, "Jehovah shall be thine everlasting light, and thy God thy glory."

The connexion, then, between the doctrine of creation and the doctrine of the sabbath is striking. It is a connexion between the six days of creating and the one day of moral administration—between six days of work and one day of rest, and of blessing and sanctifying; and it exists as well in the special character of the seventh "day," as in the division of the entire period into seven parts. But the sabbatic institution, as given to the Hebrews, was an institution not for a sabbath only, but for "sabbaths"—not for a sabbath only in every calendarial seventh day, but also for a sabbath in every calendarial seventh year, and likewise for a jubilee sabbath in the year after every seven times seven calendarial years. "The Lord spake unto Moses in Mount Sinai, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye come into the land which I give you, then shall the land keep a sabbath unto the Lord. Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard, and gather in the fruit thereof; but in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the Lord; thou shalt neither sow thy field nor prune thy vineyard. That which groweth of its own accord of thy harvest thou shalt not reap, neither gather the grapes of thy vine undressed; for it is a year of rest unto the land. And the sabbath of the land shall be meat for you; for thee and for thy servant, and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant, and for thy stranger that

Digitized by Google

sojourneth with thee, and for thy cattle, and for the beast that are in thy land, shall all the increase thereof be meat."[1] "At the end of every seven years thou shalt make a release; and this is the manner of the release: Every creditor that lendeth ought unto his neighbour shall release it; he shall not exact it of his neighbour, or of his brother, because it is called the Lord's release. If there be among you a poor man of one of thy brethren within any of thy gates in thy land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not harden thine heart nor shut thine hand from thy poor brother, but thou shalt open thine hand wide unto him, and shalt surely lend him sufficient for his need in that which he wanteth. Beware that there be not a thought in thy wicked heart, saying, The seventh year, the year of release, is at hand; and thine eye be evil against thy poor brother, and thou givest him nought, and he cry unto the Lord against thee, and it be sin unto thee. And if thy brother, an Hebrew man or an Hebrew woman, be sold unto thee and serve thee six years, then in the seventh year thou shalt let him go free from thee; and when thou sendest him out free from thee, thou shalt not let him go away empty; thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy floor, and out of thy winepress."[2] "At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read the law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, men and women and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear and that they may learn and

[1] Lev. xxv. 1–7. [2] Deut. xv. 1–14.

Digitized by Google

fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of the law, and that their children who have not known anything may hear, and learn to fear the Lord your God as long as ye live in the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it." [1]

The sabbatic year was both a highly beneficent institution to the Hebrews and a most expressive type of the order of things under the Christian dispensation; and in both respects it strikingly exemplified the results of the six epochs of creation, as realized in the epoch of the moral administration. The fallow of the land accorded exactly with the most effective treatment of the soil, as to the husbanding of its phosphates, its nitrates, its silicates, and its other rare salts, for the securing of high and permanent fertility. An omission of the fallow, in not giving the land its sabbath, tended directly to withdraw more of the salts than the land could spare, or to prevent a renewal of them by sufficient deposit of ammoniated rain, exuviæ, animal excrement, plant humus, and rock disintegration; it can clearly be traced in precurrence to the several famines which are recorded to have overtaken the nation; and, as practised throughout a long course of time in the reigns of the kings of Israel and of Judah, it not alone acted as a sterilizing scourge on the land, but incited a neglect of all the other institutions of the Hebrew covenant, up to the most sacred ones of Divine worship; and was both a prime cause of the captivity into Babylon and the rule of measurement ordained by God for that captivity's duration. The Hebrews had been warned at the very instituting of the sabbatic year that, if they should walk contrary to God, they should be expelled from the land,

[1] Deut. xxxi. 10–13.

Digitized by Google

and sent among the heathen; and they were told, "Then shall the land enjoy its sabbaths as long as it lieth desolate and ye be in your enemies' land; even then shall the land rest, and enjoy its sabbaths. As long as it lieth desolate it shall rest, because it did not rest in your sabbaths, when ye dwelt upon it."[1] Accordingly, when the time arrived, of a long course of neglect of the sabbatic year, "the king of the Chaldees" invaded their country, slew many of them with the sword, destroyed Jerusalem and the temple; "and them that had escaped from the sword carried he away to Babylon, where they were servants to him and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia, to fulfil the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed her sabbaths; for as long as it lay desolate it kept sabbath, to fulfil threescore and ten years."[2] Thus, under the Divine providence, and despite the people's disobedient and ruinous behaviour, the land was so far restored as to become again like "a fruitful field." The constitution of it, as worked out by the creation process, comprised just such amount and arrangement of the ingredients of fertility as perfectly subserved a prudent, careful, considerate husbandry, under moral enlightenment, and with highest adaptation to man's best interests jointly for time and for eternity; and when that constitution was damaged by the people's violation of the beneficent law given them for its conservation, it was now reinvigorated by a course of that Divine providence which is a sequence of creation. The course of providence, at the same time, was both a punishment upon the generation which had disobeyed and a preparation of good things for some obedient

[1] Lev. xxvi. 34, 35. [2] 2 Chron. xxxvi. 17–21.

Digitized by Google

generations which followed. Another course of providence eventually came on the land, in punishment of the consummate guilt of the last of the covenant-holding Hebrews, who "with wicked hands crucified and slew the Lord of glory;"[1] and that course of providence, in fulfilment of our Lord's denunciation and prediction, made their inheritance permanently desolate.[2] The land has ever since been "trodden down by the Gentiles." Every traveller to it now exclaims about its sterility. One American traveller, after going through it, said he would not give a farm in Tennessee for the whole kingdom of David; and every intelligent reader of the accounts of travels in it marvels at the contrast which it now presents to its ancient fertility. But all that contrast is practically a comment on the Hebrew sabbatic year. The land originally was highly fertile, "a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; a land of wheat and barley and vines and fig-trees and pomegranates; a land of oil olive and honey; a land wherein the entire Hebrew people should eat bread without scarceness and should not lack anything."[3] It maintained its high fertility so long as the sabbatic year continued to be observed, and went on to lose it in the degree in which that year went into abeyance; and it never, geologically speaking, can reacquire it otherwise than by some process which shall impart a supply of salts somewhat similar to the rich diffusion of them which the non-observance of the sabbatic year took away.

The law of the sabbatic year also tended to promote intellectual culture; evoked, directly, all thoughts and efforts connected with good husbandry; and incited,

[1] Acts ii. 23. [2] Matt. xxiii. 38; Luke xiii. 35. [3] Deut. viii. 7–9.

Digitized by Google

indirectly, to the study of all the concomitant sciences and arts. It likewise brought into play the finest and strongest principles of philanthropy and social order. The statute of release alone, which went along with it, was worth more than the best code of human laws to maintain the heart of the community in a healthy and palmy condition. And the linking of the sabbatic year with a set reading of the entire Mosaic law to the whole assembled nation, served magnificently to associate all well-being, all duty, all enjoyment, all hope with the doctrines of redemption by Christ, and to identify the very existence of the nation, their covenant possessions, their social interests, their individual salvation, and everything which concerned them for time and for eternity, with the work and reign of the Messiah who was to come. The very time of the public reading—at the feast of tabernacles—was specially instructive; for that time celebrated the ingathering of the harvest, commemorated the march from Egypt to Canaan, commenced within a week of the great day of atonement, and began and ended on a sabbath day.[1] The law of Moses, too, as it was read to them, and as it stood crystallized in the institutions around them, was a full typical exhibition of the facts and doctrines of the mediatorial reign. Its Divine kingship, its covenant land, its peculiar people, its priesthood, its tabernacle or temple, its sacred festivals, its sacrifices, its ablutions, and its other features were a glorious galaxy, displaying the same truths which fill the New Testament scriptures. They stretched across and up the Hebrew heavens, a broad way to the zenith, paved with stars. They were symbols, indeed, or figures or shadows; but

[1] Num. xxix. 12–39.

Digitized by Google

the "body" of them was Christ. Now, take these things into one view—the conservation of the fertility of the soil, the promotion of mental culture, the maintenance of social order, and the close association with all the typical teaching of the gospel—and you will see that the law of the sabbatic year stood well related to the doctrine of creation; was related to it in a way corresponding with the relation of the seventh or moral administration epoch to the six epochs of the creation work.

The law of jubilee, too, comes out in a similar manner. It was given along with the law of the sabbatic year, and was strictly an emphatic form of it, with some important additions. It said: "Thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month; in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land. And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family. A jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you: ye shall not sow, neither reap that which groweth of itself in it, nor gather the grapes in it of thy vine undressed. For it is the jubilee; it shall be holy unto you; ye shall eat the increase thereof out of the field. In the year of this jubilee ye shall return every man unto his possession."[1] It then goes on to give regulations respecting the sale of property,

[1] Lev. xxv. 8–13]

Digitized by Google

the redemption of alienated possessions, and the release or redemption of Hebrew bond-servants, with reference to the jubilee year. Its specific object was the correction of inequalities in property and condition which had arisen during the precurrent forty-nine years; so as to restore the entire commonwealth to its pristine state, and to maintain its integrity as the divinely constituted type of Christ's spiritual kingdom. But it also embodied the same principles of conservation of the soil, dependence on Divine providence, promotion of social well-being, and close association with religious observance, as the law of the sabbatic year; and it had the striking peculiarity, that the announcement of the jubilee, with all the blessings involved in it, was to be done by trumpet, through all the land, on the day of atonement. The great sacrifice of that day was for all the people; it was a collective rite for all, over and above the daily sacrifice, the sin-offerings, and the trespass-offerings; it was the comprehensive type of the sacrifice of Christ as "a ransom for all," or as "the propitiation for the sins of the whole world;" it was done with ceremonies which expressively signified the vicariousness of the sacrifice, the imputation of sin, and the carrying of it away; and here, in this law of jubilee, it was conjoined with that proclamation which secured and maintained the integrity of the Hebrew covenant and commonwealth, the aggregate typical exhibition of the reign of Christ over all ransomed men.[1] And as the proclamation was to be made with sound of trumpet through all the land, that every Hebrew might hear it, the jubilee itself became a type of spiritual life and liberty and wealth to men through the preaching of the

[1] Lev. xvi. 7–34; 1 Tim. ii. 6; 1 John ii. 2.

Digitized by Google

gospel. Hence the following allusions to it—"Blessed is the people that know the joyful sound; they shall walk, O Lord, in the light of Thy countenance."[1] "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of Him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!"[2] "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things."[3]

The entire Hebrew occupancy of Canaan was a continual sabbatism, a constant typical enjoyment of the rest which characterized the seventh or moral administration epoch, as succeeding the six epochs of creation; and, as such, it prefigured the eternal sabbatism which awaits all true Christians after death. Hence do we read—"We who have believed do enter into rest, as He said, As I have sworn in My wrath, if they shall enter into My rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For He spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all His works. And in this place again, If they shall enter into My rest. Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief; again, He limiteth a certain day, saying in David, To-day, after so long a time, as it is said, To-day if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts; for if Joshua had given them rest, then would He not afterwards have spoken of another day; there remaineth therefore a sabbatism[4] to the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from His. Let us labour there-

[1] Psa. lxxxix. 15. [2] Isa. lii. 7. [3] Rom. x. 15. [4] *σαββατισμὸς.*

Digitized by Google

fore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief."[1] "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them."[2] The seventh day epoch, the Saturday of the world, will terminate at the second advent of Christ; and then will begin the second Sunday of existence, the everlasting sabbatism of heaven.

[1] Heb. iv. 3–11. [2] Rev. xiv. 13.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IV.

PROVIDENCE.

The doctrine of Providence explained. Eight objections to it examined. Seven abuses of it exposed. A series of proofs of it illustrated.

THE schoolmen defined providence "a continual creation." That definition may be pronounced correct as regards God's performance of an act; but it is incorrect as regards the aspect in which the act is seen by men. Providence is essentially God's upholding what He has created, His sustaining what He has made; so that it is a continual exercise or manifestation of the same perfections which were exercised or manifested in creation. But men look at creation as past; at providence as present. They regard creation as the making of things; providence as the preserving, governing, and disposing of them. They see the same presence and working of Deity in the one as in the other; but they see them in different ways and with different emotions. They contemplate both with feelings of adoration; but they contemplate creation chiefly to admire, and contemplate providence chiefly to trust and to pray. Creation, in their view, is mainly a great cluster of most stupendous bygone events; while providence is a multi-

Digitized by Google

farious and ceaseless series of all sorts of past, present, and future occurrences. They think of creation as done, and paramountly as a manifestation of power; but think of providence as going on, and paramountly as a manifestation of care and love and judgment. They regard creation as the display of the Divine perfections at the beginning; and providence as the display of them thence and onward to the end. Some persons, indeed, affect to deny providence altogether; but these either practically deny creation also, or arrive at their conclusions against providence by such reasonings about imparted forces as practically resolve it into a sequence or continuance of creation. Others, on the contrary, take analytic views of it, dividing it into different kinds, which they call universal, special, and particular; but they take these views, not with reference to providence itself, but with reference to its phases or results—not as imagining any differences in the Divine working, but as classifying the occurrences in which the working is seen.

One objection against providence is the alleged incompatibility of it with what are called the laws of nature; but that objection was discussed in our chapter on the Supernatural, and needs not be again noticed. Another is the incompatibility of it with the theory of evolution or natural development; but that was discussed in our chapter on Nature. The most subtle point in it occurs in an extension of the theory, termed pangenesis. This supposes infinitesimal gemmules to be disparted from the primary cells of plants and animals, to carry with them a force of transmitting variation properties, to act at times independently of ordinary reproductivity, and occasionally to pass dor-

Digitized by Google

mantly through one or more generations, with the result of reproducing the variation properties in remote descendants; but it has not the shadow of proof, nor even much ingenuity of imagination; and, though it could be proved, it would only resolve the forces misnamed natural laws into precurrent forces of entirely the same kind as themselves—would only carry inquiry into the methods of God's working one step further backward or inward from a viewing of them on the surface—and would oblige us, as completely as we are obliged by the most ordinary view of them, to regard them as truly, entirely, wonderfully Divine. The profoundest dive which any philosopher can make into the arcana of the earth, with the intention of getting away from the manifestations of God in the open world around him, and of finding a cause for things by a search in the dark, is no more than a plunge into a tunnel, and a groping wearily through it in such glimmerings of light as stream in from its ends, with the result of emerging from it into the same blaze of the manifestions of God in the open world as that which he had left. He starts by turning his back upon the light of Deity as seen in providence; he ends, even according to his own account, by arriving at the light of Deity as seen in creation; and he has not discerned anything, is not able to speak of anything, except what he has beheld in the streamings of that light. Let philosophers theorize as they may, let them refine as they will, let them mystify mankind with new terms to the uttermost, they never either do or can account for the origin of things, or for the forces concerned in present phenomena, except by referring all to God. The utmost possible comprehensive notion they can reach is the notion of

Digitized by Google

an origination or creation of the world by an Infinite Intelligence; and that notion, as we showed in our last chapter, involves the notion of all providence.

A third objection against providence is that it implies waste of force, want of economy in the expenditure of power, a needless doing by Deity of what might be done by created agency; but this also was discussed in a previous chapter, and needs not be again noticed. A fourth objection is that providence implies a far too minute care of things, derogatory to God's dignity. This objection deals with the small, and is itself most marvellously small. It has never looked through the microscope; never read of the organic wonders of animalcules; never thought of a seed or a sporule which may multiply into progeny enough to fill a province; never dreamed of a floating speck whose fibres can be seen by higher intelligences to ramify through the system of the world, and to stretch for ages into the remote future; never adverted to such a simple incident as the falling of a fruit, which suggested to Newton the law of gravitation and pointed the way to the splendours of modern physical philosophy, or to such an incident as a transient act of monkish mountebankism in a country town, which fired the soul of Luther and lit up the European blaze of the Protestant Reformation; never, above all, reflected clearly, or reflected any way, on the condescension, the love, the mercy, the justice, the wisdom, the omipresence, the omniscience, the omnipotence of the Infinite God. If the objection could possibly tell against providence, it would tell equally against creation. The smallest things as well as the largest, the scores of denizens in a drop of water as well as the systems of worlds throughout the star-powdered

Digitized by Google

universe, display the perfections of Him who made and upholds them. The chemical forces of the minutest molecule and the vital forces of the minutest radiate, as truly as the force of gravitation among the orbs of heaven, play their part in the great scheme of existence. A question has been raised, and might admit of long debate, whether the microscope or the telescope reveals best the wondrous ways of the Divine creator and preserver. A man who intelligently looks for evidences of providence will look for them far less in any vast revolution among the nations than in the needle-point incident which remotely led to it.

A fifth objection is that providence is inconsistent with the existence of physical evil. This means that, if God had really preserved and governed the world, He would, in His infinite goodness, have prevented all such disastrous things as lightning, volcanic upbursts, earthquakes, tempests, pestilences, and famines. But some of these things belong to the very constitution of the world, insomuch that to object to them is virtually to object to the world's existence, or to the entire order of physics on which it is framed; while others are mainly a result of man's wickedness, or are due directly to men's own conduct, in the exercise of their own free-will; and all are controlled or overruled by God to effect great purposes of His moral government—insomuch that a very chief work of His providence is to control and overrule them. Say that there should have been no electricity, volcanoes, and earthquakes, and you practically say that there should have been none of the minerals, the conformations, and the organic beings which constitute the earth, and cover it with beauty, beneficence, wondrousness, and glory. Or say that

Digitized by Google

these things should have ceased when man was created, and you practically say that the earth should then have been dissolved. They carry on activities for the conservation of the world now just as surely as they carried on activities for its development during the creation epochs. You object, perhaps, that electricity sometimes does harm, as in rending a tree or inflicting a death. Well, the rending of a tree may sometimes be a good occurrence physically, and is always good morally. The very awe produced by a thunderstorm is worth more than a thousand sermons; and ought to be accompanied or followed by high adoration and reflexion, eminently salutary to the souls of the multitudes of witnesses. A death by lightning also is solemnly impressive to all who hear of it; and it is not much different to the individual who undergoes it than a death in sleep. Death, at an appointed time, must come at any rate; and death by lightning at least cuts off the suffering precurrent to death in any one of the ordinary ways. Then think of the beneficent action of electricity in the world's entire economy. Electricity is everywhere, in all sorts of objects, in land and sea and air, from lifeless matter up to man, circulating through all the globe, giving it reciprocations with the sun and stars, working incessantly millions of wonders throughout it, from its infinitesimal molecules up to its entire bulk. A single thunderstorm itself may be reinvigoration to countless myriads of organic creatures; may be virtually a new lease of life to multitudes of the highest of them; and may be prized by the very sordid wretches who can think of nothing but gain and gluttony, as worth a load of bullion in the mere effects it produces on a harvest. The very working of the

Digitized by Google

stupendous, subtle, universally diffused force of electricity is itself evidence of the presence, power, wisdom, and goodness of the Divine preserver. "The voice of His thunder is in the heaven; His lightnings enlighten the world."[1] "When He uttereth His voice, there is a multitude of waters in the heavens, and He causeth the vapours to ascend from the ends of the earth; He maketh lightnings with rain, and bringeth forth the wind out of His treasures."[2] Volcanic upburst, earthquake, and hurricane also, if we could afford space to dilate on them, might be shown to operate with great physical beneficence; and they can easily be seen to be mighty instruments of moral government, both for infliction of punishment and for teaching vast salutary lessons. The overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah and the overwhelming of Herculaneum and Pompeii are great chapters in ethics for all time. Pestilences and famines, while readily traceable to wholesale folly, negligence, and guilt on the part of communities and nations, come out in the threefold character of chastisers, sanitary improvers, and great moral teachers. What a castigator of the seething crowds of the filthy, what a cleaner away of the cesspools of disease and death, what a powerful preacher to the souls of all men, was the first great visitation of spasmodic cholera in Europe! Physical things are never, in any way, to be viewed apart from moral things. The world, as we saw in our last chapter, is under the mediatorial reign—all under moral administration. Providence works with all things as a whole, and works them all to moral ends. Let any objector about physical evil bear that fact in mind; let him use it as the indispensable medium for seeing

[1] Psa. lxxvii. 18; xcvii. 4. [2] Jer. x. 13; li. 16.

Digitized by Google

events as they really are; and he will not look anywhere, if he look intelligently, without finding cause to say, "Verily there is a reward for the righteous; verily Jehovah is a God that judgeth in the earth." [1]

A sixth objection is that providence does not comport with the existence of moral evil. This objection is very blind and very perverse. First, it does not see, or will not see, the fact of free moral agency in accountable creatures. The abuse of free moral agency alone originated and introduced moral evil, and alone is answerable for it. The free moral agency in itself was all good, all glorious, the very essence and crown of lofty elevation above irrational animals; it included equipment of every kind for the most exalted felicity, and for the everlasting possession of it; it never, if rightly used, could possibly have swerved into anything hurtful; it even stood fortified by millionfold stronger motives for constant right use than it could have or could find for abuse; and only by perversely shaking off these magnificent motives for continued well-doing did it rush into the production of moral evil. You may say, Why had it any power, even the smallest power, to go wrong? But that is just to say, Why did it exist? why was it free moral agency at all? And that again is just to say, Why was there ever an accountable creature? why any creature higher than a brute? why even any higher than a stone? Try to conceive man or angel without free agency, and you will find yourself unable to imagine such a being. You cannot go further than fancy a living biped, without power to gainsay conscience or to break a moral law; and you make that biped a brute; you deny him both the possession of

[1] Psa. lviii. 11.

Digitized by Google

conscience and the knowledge of law; or you at best suppose him, in any conceivable moral capacity, to be a mere automaton, a machine, no better than a stone. Again, the objection overlooks the manifestation of God's long-suffering, compassion, and mercy. Chapters might be written on that wonderful manifestation. The Bible is full of it; all history is full of it; all the world is full of it. Only correct your wrong views of facts; only look at men as accountable beings, instead of looking at them as mere pieces of mechanism or mere lumps of clay; only observe their noble, splendid, angelic free agency, and see what they have done with it; only mark them as fashioned to live and act like seraphim, before the throne of the Eternal, and as wheeling down in rebellion to fight against him in the earth; and you will recognize everywhere, in their very continued residence on the world, in all the conditions of it, and in their encompassment everyhow with "loving-kindness and tender mercy," such a display of constant, universal, glorious providence as will dazzle and overwhelm you. "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because His compassions fail not; they are new every morning." [1] "The Lord is gracious and full of compassion, slow to anger and of great mercy. The Lord is good to all; and His tender mercies are over all His works." [2] Further, the objection takes no account of the love and grace of God in the scheme of redemption. It talks of providence; alleges providence to be inconsistent with the existence of moral evil; yet says nothing of the fact that "for this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil." [3] Better far to

[1] Lam. iii. 22, 23. [2] Psa. cxlv. 8, 9. [3] 1 John iii. 8.

Digitized by Google

argue that there is no sunshine in the world because moles and bats live in the dark. The scheme of redemption streams glory on the earth, not, as the sunlight does, in alternations with darkness and only on the surface, but in continual enspherement and downward to the core; it streams forth perpetually a moral glory of infinite love, including all moral providence, and subordinating to its ends all physical providence; and it was framed and is carried on, not merely to restrain or to diminish moral evil, but to destroy it; nor even only to destroy sin, but to transform and exalt the sinner to a vastly grander character and condition than those he lost by his fall. The self-sold slave of moral evil, the self-inmolated victim of eternal death, is not only rescued, but is ransomed, justified, purified, glorified. And at what a price was He redeemed! "Not with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."[1] "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, that God sent His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins."[2] "When we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly; for scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die; but God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."[3] Think of that love, of its Divine disinterestedness, of its sovereign freeness, of how it was manifested, of what it cost the Son of God, of how it works, and of what it effects; and you

[1] 1 Pet. i. 18. [2] 1 John iv. 9, 10. [3] Rom. v. 6-8.

Digitized by Google

will see your objection vanishing like a thread of mist in a summer day.

A seventh objection is that providence does not comport with free moral agency. This is nearly the reverse of the preceding. The contention in that was pretty much as if free agency ought not to be in the field at all; and the contention in this is pretty much as if free agency ought to have the field all to itself. We might simply pitch the one after the other, and have done with it; but we find in the latter a point of subtlety which requires a moment's notice. The objector, of course, understands by free moral agency the freedom of the will. Now, can he say what the freedom of the will is? can he define it? If he can, he will rescue the metaphysicians from a great trouble. These acutest of men have been fighting about it, in nearly equal phalanx, since almost the day when metaphysics became a science; and they look as if they would fight about it, in nearly equal phalanx, till the hour come when contentions of every kind will cease. But let the objector select the highest view of the freedom of the will, the view which we ourselves hold, that the will does not determine itself, but is determined by motives; what then? It is not coerced by the motives; it does not even suffer direct impact by them; it sees them through the judgment; and it tests them by the conscience. Or, to speak more plainly, as the mind is one and indivisible, the mind discerns the motives, examines them, reasons about them, looks at them in the light of whatever knowledge of right and wrong it possesses, and determines to accept or reject them according to the conclusion respecting them at which it arrives. Or if, in any instances, it does not do these things, it has

Digitized by Google

power to do them, and ought to do them; and it is, consequently, responsible for every determination which it makes, or for every volition which it forms and carries out. Can the objector himself depict a freer agency in the mind? or can he now imagine anything in which it does not comport with providence? Yet he may say that persons who hold this notion of it, nevertheless, lead it up to another position by linking it with the doctrine of predestination. Let him say so; what then? He himself holds the doctrine of God's perfect foreknowledge of all events; he cannot but hold it, as essential to the idea of God's infinitude; and he may trace from it exactly all the same consequences which flow from the other doctrine. Predestination, indeed, as regards acts to be done by God Himself, or as regards good things to be given by Him, proceeds entirely on His own purpose or on "the counsel of His own will;" but, as regards the results of men's own volitions, or as regards chastisement or punishment due to them for breaking His law, it proceeds on His foreknowledge of what they shall do. Or, in the former case, indeed, it is predestination on the ground of sovereignty; but, in the latter case, it is predestination on the ground of equity. Is there any interference with man's free agency in that? The events, it is true, are certain; but, as respects all of them flowing from men's own volitions, they are certain simply as infallibly foreknown. But the foreknowledge of them by Deity does not, in the slightest degree, affect man's free agency in doing them; or if it could be argued to have any conceivable effect, it is recognized as completely by the objector's view as by our own. It really, like every other perfection of the Infinite One, immensely transcends our power of com-

Digitized by Google

prehension, and mainly incites us to admire and adore; yet it can readily be seen to make not the remotest interference with man's free agency. A pretty clear foresight of what an individual man, in given circumstances, will do—a foresight so clear as to amount to moral certainty, and to be expressible in formal prediction—can often be formed by a sagacious neighbour, who knows something of his character; but, if not communicated to him, it exists practically as an abstraction, and has no manner of effect on what he either thinks or does.

An eighth objection, and the last we shall notice, is that providence does not comport with the inequalities which prevail in the distribution of property and happiness. This sometimes goes so far as to say that the world is all in confusion, and looks rather to want providence than to have it. Even good men have often been so much caught by it as to doubt for a time whether the fatherly care of God were not shown fully more to the wicked than to the righteous. David himself once was so carried off by it that "his feet were almost gone;" and when "he thought to know" the prosperity of the wicked as contrasted to the adversity of the righteous, it "was too painful for him, until he went into the sanctuary of God," and "then understood he their end;" then also he awoke as from a dream, got an astounding and abasing sight of the delusion he had been under, and exclaimed respecting it, "So foolish was I, and ignorant; I was as a beast before thee."[1] Any ill-informed observer who shall see a case like that of Lazarus and Dives in the parable, will no doubt think Lazarus to have almost nothing but misery, and Dives to have

[1] Psa. lxxiii. 2-22.

Digitized by Google

almost nothing but happiness; and he too, in the opinion which he formed, will be "as a beast." Any heathen Roman citizen also who should have looked at Paul in the Roman prison, and at Nero on the Roman throne, would have pronounced Paul a wretch and Nero a demi-god; and could he have seen the former soaring like a seraph and the latter sweltering like a fiend, he would have been astounded quite as much as David was when David "understood the end." Any inequalities which exist in the distribution of well-being in the world are all on the surface; nor indeed are even there, but exist only in appearance or "as in a dream." See things truly, and you see them all right. The apparent prosperity of the wicked is really their curse, falling on them as the curse fell on Ephraim, in execution of the doom, "Ephraim is joined to idols, let him alone;"[1] and the apparent adversity of the righteous is really their blessing, the chastising evidence of their heavenly Father's love, the benign discipline to make them "partakers of His holiness" and to fit them for heaven, "light affliction and but for a moment, working for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."[2] What looks like confusion in the course of providence looks like confusion only in the view of the ignorant, and appears all perfect order and consummate beauty in the view of the instructed. Any unlettered man who watches the motion of the stars will see many of them to be a maze, eccentric, intercrossing, and contradictory; but let him learn a little astronomy, and he will see them to be exquisitely regular, far more than the movement of a chronometer. Any man ignorant of the Bible, in the same way, thinks the course of providence confused; but

[1] Hos. iv. 17. [2] Heb. xii. 5–11; 2 Cor. iv. 17.

Digitized by Google

let him get a little acquaintance with revealed truth, and he will see everything to be "glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

We do not require to write more than a few sentences on the abuses of the doctrine of providence; and we require to write even these, only because the abuses are sometimes handled as objections. The abuse of anything always implies both the goodness of it and a right use of it, and never can be legitimately employed as an argument against it. Only a good thing can be abused; and only a highly good thing can be greatly abused. But the abuses of the doctrine of providence are very great. One of them is discontentment. A man who does not believe in providence may be as discontented as he likes; he is, at least, consistent. But a man who believes in providence and yet is discontented, behaves as absurdly as if he were always hungry, always had food, and would never eat it. He is bound, "in whatsoever state he is, therewith to be content."[1] He is bound even "in everything to give thanks, for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning him;"[2] "to give thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, submitting himself to others in the fear of God."[3] Another abuse is to repine at disappointments, reverses, sufferings, and bereavements. The believer in providence who does that accuses it of injustice or severity; asserts it to confer less good upon him, or to inflict more chastisement, than he deserves; denies its benignity; and fights against God. Whoever sees providence rightly, or makes right use of its teachings, knows and feels that God "doeth all things well;" and, though he should be stripped as bare by disaster

[1] Phil. iv. 11. [2] 1 Thess. v. 18. [3] Eph. v. 20, 21.

Digitized by Google

and bereavement as Job was, will say, "The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord."[1] A third abuse is a man's ascribing to his own merit or skill or enterprise, instead of ascribing to the free bounty of his heavenly Father, the good things which he enjoys. Nebuchadnezzar did something like this when he said, "Is not this great Babylon that I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty?"[2] Yet the proud heathen acted only in character; for he was already mad, and fancied himself to be superhuman, and was ready for going out and grazing among cattle. But a professed believer in providence who ascribes his prosperity to himself, acts so awfully out of character as to put himself in the place of God. He may, like the Pharisee, say, "God, I thank thee;" but like the Pharisee, he is really thanking himself.[3] He goes into the temple of God, and there first scatters the heavenly fire on the altar, then walks in sparks of his own kindling;[4] or, staying at home, he first denies that the sun shines, and then asserts that his crops were ripened by the light and heat of his own candle.

A fourth abuse is presumptuous expectation, on the part of a believer in providence, that he shall continue to enjoy past and present prosperity, and shall receive any particular good thing which he may desire. No man has a right to any such expectation; and none who has correct views of providence will entertain it. What has been good for you in the past may not be good for you in the future, and may be withdrawn; and what you can properly expect is, not what you yourself may desire, but what your heavenly Father may see best to send.

[1] Job i. 21. [2] Dan. iv. 30. [3] Luke xviii. 11. [4] Isa. l. 11.

Digitized by Google

You cannot even rightly ask anything from God except what He has promised to give; and you are not even to ask the fulfilment of His promises according to your own interpretation of them, but according to His. A fifth abuse is undue dependence on the instrumentalities of providence. Instrumentalities or means, in all ordinary matters, are always intermediate between the Divine worker and what He works; but they must not be regarded as more than instrumentalities; they must not be treated as if they, and not God, worked out the results. Money, for example, requires to be employed by men in most of the transactions of life; and fine weather is properly viewed by them as requisite for the growth of crops. But "if I have made gold my hope, or have said to the fine gold, Thou art my confidence; if I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness, and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand; this were an iniquity to be punished by the judge; for I should have denied the God that is above."[1] A sixth abuse is the neglect of such means as are in our power, and as require to be employed. If a man expect to have good health while he neglects a sanitary regimen, or if he expect his crops to be excellent after careless tillage of the soil, saying all the while that he trusts in providence, he really does not trust in providence at all, but trusts in heathenish fate, and is simply inventing excuses for brutal sloth and idleness. He also is breaking the Divine precepts, which enjoin him to "labour six days and do all his work," to "labour, working with his hands the thing which is good," and "to provide things honest in the sight of all men;"[2] and he is not entitled to expect anything but the recompense of

[1] Job xxxi. 24–28. [2] Exod. xx. 9; Eph. iv. 28; Rom. xii. 17.

Digitized by Google

a law-breaker. A seventh abuse, the last we shall notice, is ascribing the work of providence to created or imaginary things. This is done, in dreadful amount and in a multitude of ways, by the thoughtless and the ungodly, who make little or no recognition of God, and behave like heathens; but it is done also, in no small degree, by many persons who express devout belief in providence. Rites and tricks and fetishes, not a few, handed down from the old pagans, are occasionally used by some grave professing Christians to bring them desired temporal blessings. Even some remnant of the vile belief in astrology, that ancient abomination which is the main thing branded in the Scriptures by the name of what the English version calls "witchcraft," may sometimes be found floating, in the utterances of some of them, side by side, with denunciations of science, with misapplication of the text which speaks of "science falsely so called."[1] Nay, we can possibly find a printed sermon by an evangelical preacher, which talks of blessings by "the selectest influences of the stars." What shall we say about a preacher who talks in that way? Shall we say, Give him a Bible? Certainly, give him that; but give him also a few lessons in common sense.

As to the evidences of providence, where shall we begin? They are so multitudinous, so various, so universal, that we feel at a loss where or how to select. Belief in providence seems to be innate in man, like belief in God; or, if not itself innate, is a corollary of innate belief in God. Where can you find men without it? Some of the best ancient heathen moralists, as Cicero, Seneca, Plutarch, expressly taught it. All the ancient heathen peoples embodied it, in some way or

[1] 1 Tim. vi. 20.

Digitized by Google

other, in their mythologies. Modern savages, even the most degraded, all have some form or other of it; and some of them have it as almost their only sort of religion. Mahomedans have it in the abused form of belief in fate; insomuch as often to decline using means for averting calamity or death. Thoughtless or wicked persons in Christian lands occasionally avow it in seasons of danger; and, though seldom or never avowing it in other seasons, always hold it and act upon it under some disguise. They think of "luck," or "fortune," or "the stars," or of "something turning up," or of "the chapter of accidents;" and many of them are so sneaking as to go heathenishly about it in forms of soothsaying and charms. The very infidel savants are full of it. They, indeed, disavow it, denounce it, build up arguments and systems against it; but they put away only the name of it, and hold fast all the reality itself. They call providence "natural laws;" and they expect from it under that name all the same results which Christians expect from it under its proper name. They differ from Christians about it mainly in having no thankfulness to God for it, and no adoration of Him on account of it; and they change the name of *it* mainly to get rid of sense of obligation to *Him*. They view it exactly as Christians view it with reference to events; but they refuse to view it at all with reference to conscience. They allege the forces which they call "natural laws" to work like a machine; yet are as much on the look out for extraordinary occurrences under them, and as much struck with these occurrences when they happen, excepting only in their soul or conscience, as any intelligent Christians are. They know well that the forces, though individually uniform and permanent, undergo adjust-

Digitized by Google

ments and combinations among one another to produce very singular or special events; they know well, too, that such adjustments and combinations often take place in spheres immensely beyond reach of man's penetration, and in ways very widely different from any which the wisest human prognosticator could have anticipated; and they steer their own course in life, and make computations for "contingencies," as distinctly by recognition of these facts as Christians do by overt recognition of providence. All true Christians, of course, hold belief in providence as a prominent article in their creed. A handful of persons claiming to be Christians, it is true, discard it; but they do with it precisely what the infidel savants do; they merely change its name, and call it "natural laws;" and they are so far better than the infidel savants, that they regard its operations with some conscience. Now whence came belief in providence, or tantamount to that belief, universally into the human mind? Came it by intuition, like the notion of God's existence? or came it by diffusion of revealed truth, either as from the early oral revelations or as from the Scriptures? or came it by universal observation of manifest Divine agency in the affairs of the world? or came it by combined effect of all these three kinds of teachings? Solve the question how you may, you are led by it to a sure recognition of the doctrine of providence.

The fact of providence, as we showed in our previous chapter, is a necessary sequence of the fact of creation. The making or producing of a thing, even on the part of men, is not a making or producing and done with it. The thing made is made for a purpose, belongs to the maker, and is cared for by him. He regards it in the

Digitized by Google

future as he regarded it in the past; and he preserves it or disposes of it accordantly with the purpose which he had when making it. Even parentage, which is greatly less than making, involves a right over the offspring and a scrupulous care to support and govern them. What, then, shall be said respecting making and parentage by the Almighty? The difference is immense; it is the difference between the finite and the infinite; and it is all in one direction—simply upward or greater. Whatever can be said as to the concomitants of making or parentage by man, can be said infinitely more as to the concomitants of making or parentage by God. Not only that; but it must be said with the momentous addition that, on His part, the making or parentage is of an inconceivably higher order; is not a producing out of precious material, but a creating out of nothing. The notion of a man's making a thing without a purpose is absurd; and the notion of God's creating the world without a purpose is infinitely more so. The notion of a man's making a thing, especially an elaborate or complicated thing, without having subsequent care over it, also is absurd; and the notion of God's creating the complicated world and all its immense complication of constituences, without having subsequent care over them, also is infinitely more so. His very purpose to create, too, was essentially a purpose to preserve and govern. Creation was not for the moment only, but for all duration. Not the starting of the world into existence merely, but everything which should ever occur in it, was present in the purpose to create. The world's being for all time, with whatever should be in it anywhere or everywhere at each successive moment to the last, was before the Creator's view as a present and perpetual now.

Digitized by Google

"He declared the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all My pleasure." [1] His very prescience rendered all the future to be the same as the present, and occasioned the act of creation to go continuously or identically into a course of providence. Then, think of His other perfections. "He that denies providence," remarks Charnock, "denies most of God's attributes; he denies at least the exercise of them; he denies his omniscience, which is the eye of providence; mercy and justice, which are the arms of it; power, which is its life and motion; wisdom, which is the rudder whereby providence is steered; and holiness, which is the compass and rule of its motion."

Providence, indeed, stands on the same kind of evidence as creation. The works of the one as surely indicate a Divine hand as the work of the other. Look at the mere chemical actions which are continually in operation. Who can tell their number? Who can estimate their aggregate force, their mutual intricacies, their all-pervading connexion with the sustenance of the world, and of everything which the world contains? Only omniscience. Nor can less than omnipotence keep them going, or less than infinite wisdom adjust them to their ends, or less than Divine love clothe them all and ever with their gladsome beneficence. A trivial blunder in the mimic laboratory of a chemist, such as the ill-timing of a mixture or a little too much heat, has sometimes utterly smashed both process and apparatus, or blown the whole laboratory, chemist and all, into the air. But not an error, not a derangement, not a trace of the remotest mishap, ever occurs or can occur in the stu-

[1] Isa. xlvi. 10.

Digitized by Google

pendous laboratory of the world. The worker here was also the maker. He who rearranges the elements and substances here also created them. He who makes changes here gives every change both its origin and its commission. And He is "wonderful in counsel and excellent in working," and does all things "after the counsel of His own will."[1] "He is in one mind, and who can turn Him."[2] Nor does it alter the case to say, as many savants say, that the chemical forces are in the substances; for, as was shown in our chapter on the Supernatural, they can at the utmost, we argued, have been put previsively there by God at the creation—which is tantamount to saying that they are ever wielded directly by Him in providence; and moreover, they are capable of undergoing, and do undergo, adjustments or combinations to work out new or special or extraordinary ends. Then, as to organic beings, the myriad millions of plants, the myriad millions of animals, the countless multitudes of their kinds, the infinity of their reciprocations with one another and with minerals, the conflict of interest at thousands of points between some sets and others, the maintenance of equipoise throughout the prodigious commonwealth of their life; and as to mankind, in their communities and nations, in their intellects and consciences, under every grade and variety of revolt, with every form and force of perversity, in ceaseless competition and conflict, individual with individual and people with people, all a seething ocean of thought and passion and tumult; who can calmly, for a moment, take a glance at these, and not see that the work of governing them cannot be less than Divine—cannot conceivably be other than the work of an omnipotent, omnipresent,

[1] Isa. xxviii. 29; Eph. i. 11. [2] Job xxiii. 13.

Digitized by Google

omniscient, infinitely wise, and infinitely gracious providence? The Most High, "by His strength setteth fast the mountains, being girded with power; He stilleth the noise of the seas, the noise of the waves, and the tumult of the people."[1] The psalmist first extols Him as having made the heavens and the host of them, and as having created the earth by His word, as having commanded and it stood fast; and then he goes on to say, "The counsel of the Lord standeth for ever, the thoughts of His heart to all generations. The Lord looketh from heaven; He beholdeth all the sons of men. From the place of His habitation, He looketh upon all the inhabitants of the earth. Behold, the eye of the Lord is upon them that fear Him, upon them that hope in His mercy, to deliver their soul from death, and to keep them alive in famine. Our soul waiteth for the Lord; He is our help and our shield."[2]

Providence is proved also by the order, both physical and moral, which prevails in the world. An objection, indeed, as we saw, is raised against it on the opposite ground of alleged disorder; but that objection does no more than evoke answers which lift us up to very lofty and convincing views of providence. The alleged disorder is never more than apparent, never deeper than the surface; and always overlies order, which is ever perfect and often profound. So striking, so uniform, so universal is the order as even to have been made the basis of that most subtle of all objections, which transmutes providence into what are called "natural laws." Unbelieving savants concentrate all their objections in this one; they look beneath the surface of events, and downward as far as they can penetrate; they contem-

[1] Psa. lxv. 6, 7. [2] Psa. xxxiii. 6–20.

Digitized by Google

plate events, not singly or in detachments, but through as many connexions as can possibly be traced; and they see everywhere such consummate order as seems to them like the working of a perfect machine. They make the very order which prevails their reason for denying providence. They say that providence implies variableness, that the world shows no variableness, and that therefore providence cannot be. But they impute to providence no other variableness than arises from adjustments or combinations of the forces or "natural laws" which they substitute for it; and they maintain, as we do, that all these forces are uniform and permanent. They thus are stout witnesses to the order which prevails—witnesses to it from at once extensive observation, deep research, and acute deduction; and they go wrong, as we have more than once shown, chiefly in treating providence as previsive instead of actual, or in supposing the powers of it to have been lodged in the world once for all at creation. Their logic and their philosophy are erroneous; but not their facts. They array the facts clearly and strongly, and they show them all to be proof of perfect order. Nor only that; but they show them to arise all from forces immensely superhuman, nothing short of Divine, ascribable only to the omnipotent, omniscient, infinitely wise and beneficent Creator. We, therefore, might leave the argument from order to be worked out by the very savants who formally deny providence. But as the facts with which they deal are principally of the recondite sort known only to scientific men, we point also to a few general facts known or knowable by every ordinary observer—such as the motions of the heavenly bodies, the revolution of the seasons, the alternations of day and night, the process

Digitized by Google

of reproduction in plants and animals, the relative numbers of the sexes, the general mental happiness of good men, the general mental misery of the bad, the influence and honour which generally attend the righteous, the discovery and punishment of crime which often overtake the wicked, and the retribution for good or for evil which, in one way or other, generally comes on all men. Reflect on these facts, and on such as these; consider what multitudinous, intricate, and hidden influences are concerned with them; and you will see in them strong and manifold proofs that God upholds and governs the world.

Providence is proved, again, by the salient events in all history. Trace the course of civilization and religion; trace especially the rise and progress of the Hebrew commonwealth, the far-spread influence of the Mosaic legislation, the connexions of the prophets with Nineveh and Babylon, the stimulations of the Hebrew faith on the Greeks and the Romans, the silent yet manifest preparation of the world for the advent of Christ, the rise of Christianity in our Lord's personal ministry, "the handful of corn" whose fruit "shook like Lebanon,"[1] the moral revolution which followed the ministry of the apostles, the triumph of the gospel throughout the Roman empire in spite of all efforts to destroy it, the concurrence of great invention, great discovery, and great revival of literature immediately before the Protestant Reformation, and the beginnings, vicissitudes, and triumphs of that reformation itself; and you will see, in every stage of the history, the broad footprints of the Divine ruler of the world. Trace also the rise and fall of the ancient great monarchies, the Babylonian, the

[1] Psa. lxxii. 16.

Digitized by Google

Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman; trace them even in their own annals, apart from God's predictions, which long previously foretold them; trace them through the marvellous series of incidents which came out, one after another, in seeming contrariety to preceding or accompanying circumstances; and you will see there also, at every step, the obvious working of the Divine "governor among the nations."[1] Trace likewise the history of modern nations, the rise of some, the fall of others, their relations with one another, their alliances, their collisions, their conflicts; mark how they come or go, increase or decrease, make sudden acquisition, or suffer sudden loss, in ways utterly astonishing to themselves; and you will see there likewise, at every turning, plain indication that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will."[2] Trace, again, the personal history of any number of the most distinguished men, in any land or at any time—princes, statesmen, soldiers, scholars, merchants, or whatever else; observe how some go suddenly up to elevation in spite of the apparent concurrence of everything to keep them down, how others go suddenly down to debasement in spite of the apparent concurrence of everything to keep them up, and how others sweep suddenly hither and thither like an ill-poised kite during an apparent continuance of self-same circumstances; and you will see there plentiful evidence that "the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong,"[3] and that "promotion cometh neither from the east nor from the west nor from the south, but God putteth down one and setteth up another."[4] Trace, further, the unwilling testimonies

[1] Psa. xxii. 28. [2] Dan. iv. 17. [3] Eccles. ix. 11.
[4] Psa. lxxv. 6, 7.

Digitized by Google

which bad men have been constrained to bear, or the unwilling services they have been constrained to render, to the interests of Divine truth; note a few of the instances in which the impious have been obliged to speak well of the devout, or in which gainsayers of the gospel have been drawn to propagate it, or in which infidel savants have made researches to impeach the Bible, only with the result of strongly confirming it; and you will see there proof of the rule of providence over even the worst passions of mankind. "At thy rebuke, O God of Jacob, both the chariot and horse are cast into a dead sleep. Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee; the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain."[1]

Providence is proved, further, by the existence of the religious principle in man. That principle is inseparable from conscience and from innate belief in God's existence, and it expresses itself in prayer. Every sane man, in some manner or other, prays. Many persons, indeed, do not pray formally; but all sane ones pray really. Prayer is not necessarily formal; but, even when enlightened and earnest, is mainly "the soul's sincere desire, uttered or unexpressed." Avowed infidels have *wishes* for things which no created power can give them. Blasphemers, when surprised by sudden danger, utter ejaculations for Divine help. Savages often, or even statedly, give vent to supplication in cries and yells. The ancient heathens, the very sages of Athens, were remarkable for number and variety of devotions.[2] All Christians, of course, pray. Now "he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him."[3] Prayer implies providence. A man who prays intelligently to God is

[1] Psa. lxxvi. 6–10. [2] Acts xvii. 22. [3] Heb. xi. 6.

Digitized by Google

like a little child asking a piece of bread from a parent. He believes that God can give him what he asks, and is willing to give it, and he expects to receive it. "What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will ye give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him?"[1] Or a man who prays intelligently to God is like a farmer who "plougheth in hope" and "thresheth in hope;" and who, in confident reliance on the course of providence expects to realize grain from the ploughing and the threshing.[2] He works as well as prays, if working is required—uses means as well as prays, if the use of means is suitable; but he both works and prays in recognition of God's government and promises, and in expectation of God's giving him what he works for and asks. To do otherwise would be mockery; both mockery of himself and mockery of God. Prayer has been treated, by a few speculators, as a sort of mere moral gymnastics; but, when so treated, is an utter delusion. These persons claim to be Christians, yet deny providence. What, then, can they do with prayer? They find no use for it, no meaning in it, in its proper character as an asking of blessings; yet they cannot afford to dispense with the form of it; they would show their profession of Christianity to be a bubble, and would burst the bubble into spray if they did not maintain the form of prayer; and, being unable to make anything more of it, they pronounce it a good exercise for bracing and strengthening the soul. No sham is good. Let them try the analogue of this sham, by ploughing and

[1] Matt. vii. 9-11. [2] 1 Cor. ix. 7-10.

Digitized by Google

threshing elsewhere than in a genial clime and on an earthy soil; let them go to the polar regions, and there plough the ice, pulverize it, sow it, thresh it; how long will they go on? They find the employment excellent gymnastics; but can they get food by it or live? No more can they morally get food or live by the moral gymnastics of any prayer which does not recognize Divine providence. All real prayer, all genuine religion, rests on belief that "the Lord reigneth,"[1] and that He "waits to be gracious."[2] "Thou shalt call, and the Lord shall answer: thou shalt cry, and He shall say, Here I am."[3] "He will be very gracious unto thee at the voice of thy cry; when He shall hear it, He will answer thee."[4] "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you; for every one that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened."[5] "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you. Hitherto have ye asked nothing in My name; ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full."[6] "O Thou that hearest prayer, unto Thee shall all flesh come."[7]

Providence, finally, is proved by Scripture. We have, both in the present chapter and in previous ones, incidentally quoted several passages which either expressly teach it or fully imply it; and we might here quote hundreds more. All the Bible, in some way or other, is full of it. The very existence of the Bible is an instance of it. The very giving to man of the several and successive books of the Bible was a series of prime acts of

[1] Psa. xcvi. 10; xcvii. 1; xcix. 1. [2] Isa. xxx. 18. [3] Isa. lviii. 9.
[4] Isa. xxx. 19. [5] Matt. vii. 7, 8 [6] John xvi. 23, 24.
[7] Psa xv 2

Digitized by Google

it. The circumstances in which these books were given, and the signs and wonders with which the giving of some of them was accompanied, were striking exemplifications of it. The influence exerted by the Bible on the moral condition of mankind, as well on the civilization and the intellectual culture of the multitude as on the spiritual exaltation of the select few, has been a continual course of it. Providence figures as much in the Bible as triangles and circles figure in Euclid. The doctrinal parts teach it; the preceptive parts enjoin confidence in it; the devotional parts embody thanksgivings for its blessings received and prayers for its blessings desired; the descriptive parts depict and celebrate its actings; the prophetic parts foretell its future evolutions; and the historical parts narrate the things which it has done. Nor is there any vagueness in what any of them say. All, in their several ways, as to who teaches, who enjoins, who is to be thanked and supplicated, who did the things described, who is to do the things foretold, and who did the things narrated, say expressly it is God. Neither is there any want of specification in what they say. They speak not only generally or roundly, but also specifically and minutely; not only of the heavens, the earth, the sea, angels, men, animals, herbs, and the fulness of the world, but also of light, lightning, winds, hail, snow, rain, dew, mountains, valleys, deserts, fields, gardens, floods, waves, rivers, brooks, wells, angelic ministrations, particular acts of angels, every several class of men, the employments of men, the physical interests of men, all varieties of the moral phases of men, families, communities, nations, wars, pestilences, famines, very many kinds of animals, prosperity to man in connexion with animals, chastisements on man by means of animals,

Digitized by Google

very many kinds of plants, prosperity through plants, chastisements through plants, the hairs of our head, and the bounds of our habitation. Neither is there any want of detail in what they say; least of all is there any want of it in those matters of providence which closely affect man in the ordinary affairs of his life. Their histories and their biographies, in particular, are a continuous exposition of God's omniscient, all-wise, all-beneficent reign over men in everything which can concern them, and of the beliefs, the duties, and the devotions which devolve on them from His infinite care and love. Look, especially, at the histories of Joseph, of Abraham, of the Israelites in the wilderness, of the Israelites in Canaan, of David, of Elijah, of Hezekiah, of the Jews in Persia, and of the apostle Paul; and see there detailed courses of Divine providence as in a moving panorama all aflame with the light of heaven and the colours of the rainbow. The sublime vision of Ezekiel—when the likeness of four living creatures, resembling men and all ablaze like burning coals, came out of the midst of a great cloud, with fiery centre and surrounding brightness; when each of the living creatures had four faces, like the faces of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle, four wings joined two and two, and the hands of a man under their wings; when they went every one straight forward, whither the spirit was to go, and were pervaded up and down by bright fire, and moved like a flash of lightning; when a wheel within a wheel, yellowish-green like beryl, so high as to be dreadful, and with the rims full of eyes round about, was upon the earth by each of the living creatures, and had the spirit of the living creature in it; when the living creatures and the wheels moved or stood together, went onward or upward or downward together, whither-

Digitized by Google

soever the spirit was to go; when the noise of their wings, as they went, was like the noise of great waters; as the voice of the Almighty, the voice of speech, as the noise of an host; and when an outstretched firmament was over them, as the colour of the terrible crystal, and above the firmament the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone, with the glory of Jehovah all around that sublime vision, so gorgeously emblematic of the universal, omniscient, omnipotent, infinitely wise, benign, and glorious administration of God in our world, is symbolical either of all providence whatever, or of what is tantamount to that, all providence over the church. Interpret the details of it how you may; identify these with the material and vital and moral forces which the Creator has put into His creatures, if you will; they distinctly show that God's reign on the earth is personal, providential, and exhibitive of all His perfections; and they show, too, that it is the reign of God as manifested in Christ. "Above the firmament," says Ezekiel, "was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone; and upon the likeness of a throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above it. And I saw as the colour of amber, as the appearance of fire round about within it, from the appearance of his loins even upward, and from the appearance of his loins even downward, I saw as it were the appearance of fire, and it had brightness round about. As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of Jehovah." [1]

[1] Ezek. i. 4-28.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER V.

MANKIND.

The questions here regard Man only in his relative place among the works of the Creator; how these are to be discussed as between Scripture and science; the origin of Man as announced in the Bible, and as treated by sceptics; the antiquity of Man as deduced by most Christian writers from the Bible, as supposed by a few Christians to be pre-Adamite, as contended by many savants to be very remote; eighteen alleged facts for the very remote antiquity, and a series of arguments against it; the unity of the human race, argued from their intellectuality, from their faculty of speech, from their original equipment for every purpose of art and science, from their very physical varieties, and from their common capacity for the common salvation; the original condition of Man in art, science, and religion; five wrong opinions and the right one as to what civilization is; the civilized state of Adam, of the Antediluvians, of the descendants of Noah, and of the ancient Hebrews; pristine civilization, argued from the inertness of savageism, from the difference between brute instinct and human intellect, from the relation of instruction to civilized practice, from the prominence of true religion over science and art, from the mental and moral condition of savages, from the physical condition of savages, from the traditions of all ancient civilized nations, from the general history of civilization, from the history of each of the elements of civilization, from the history of each of the most remarkable of the civilized nations, and from the verdict of the most distinguished ethnologists.

WE are not here to discuss man in any comprehensive manner; for, if we were, we might identify him with all

Digitized by Google

religions, all sciences, allarts, or might so treat him as to touch almost every topic of a universal encyclopædia. We are not to consider what he does or what he has produced. We are not to consider even his organization or psychology, or his animal functions and mental faculties. We are to view him merely, or at least chiefly, in his relative place among God's works of creation and providence. We shall therefore comprise all we have here to say respecting him in four topics—first, his origin; second, his antiquity, or the period when he began to be; third, his specific character, or the unity of his race, together with its divisions; and fourth, his original condition, as to its equipments for religion, science, and art.

These topics really ought not to require any discussion. The Bible, even without any note or comment, clearly, succinctly, and completely settles them. But the scepticism of our age, like the scepticism of any former age, will not hear the Bible. The scepticism of our age, too, deals largely with these topics about man, and attempts to turn them against the Bible; and it claims to be highly scientific, and has got a hearing among many professing Christians. Hence arises a necessity, for the sake of both the sceptics and their disciples, that these topics should be discussed, we shall not say in a Bible light, or in an anti-sceptic light, but in a full light, or thoroughly, or on all sides. Let all things, by all means, be said about them which science or philosophies can truly say; but let all things also be said about them which the Bible says. Even though this glorious book were not what all true Christians believe or know or feel it to be, it is at least a vastly more venerable one than any of those which the sceptics venerate or quote; is so even on their own

Digitized by Google

showing; and cannot, without excessive inconsistency, be ignored by them as professed inquirers after truth Here is a book which tells them far more on the topics about man than is told them by all other books put together; and tells it in a manner of paramount credibility. Yet they fully consult the other books, and do not consult this; nay, they measure out their conclusions accordantly with the other books, and then employ these conclusions to measure it. Was ever conduct more unphilosophical or illogical? Any similar behaviour in the common things of life would be universally regarded as an outrage on common sense. They allege, indeed, as an excuse for not taking the Bible into their account, that it is a religious book. But is not that a reason, a most urgent and an overwhelming one, all the other way? Man is a religious being, or let us say rather a being with religious intuitions; may be distinguished by these intuitions much more distinctly than by anything else from the brutes beneath him; and therefore is likely to be described defectively or wrongly by books which are not religious, and can be described fully or rightly by no book but a religious one, which treats him in all his aspects as well moral as physical. Hence might all the anti-biblical conclusions advanced by sceptics be summarily set aside as false, on the simple ground that they are worked out by a vicious process.

Science is wronged by them in a converse way. They profess to do it all honour, but they really treat it very badly. Facts alone are legitimate to it; facts alone constitute it; and facts, accordingly, they largely give. But they do not give facts only, or even chiefly; nor do they give them in a proper way. What they mainly give is theory; what they mainly use for working out

Digitized by Google

their conclusions is speculation. They, no doubt, vary much among themselves, some employing facts much more largely than others do; but, taking them in the aggregate, they are not scientific men dealing only with facts, but mainly theorists dealing with hypotheses. They practically, though not avowedly, begin and carry on and finish a fabric of sheer theories; and they do no more or little else with facts than to cover and defend these. They make the theories their citadel, and the facts a mere outwork. Nor do they even construct the outwork with facts as they find them. As many facts, indeed, as seem not unsuited to their purpose are lifted and laid down unbroken and in order; but many others are either hammered to the destruction of their proportions, or selected in units exceptionally to the exclusion of hundreds or even thousands generally; or, what is worse, are ground into powder and chemicalized into factitious matter. Some pieces of the fabric are genuine facts, correctly positioned; other pieces, above these, are abnormal facts, unaccompanied by their congeners, and therefore deceptive; and others, still higher, and in great aggregate, are not facts at all, but inferences, second-descent inferences, third-descent inferences, set off as alleged facts in room of alleged remote facts from which they are alleged to be drawn. The entire outwork, too, is a mere screen, pretty high, it may be, but as weak as high, serving no purpose except to conceal the citadel. Nor, weak though it is, and certain to fall at a stroke, does it need to be assailed. Let any man ascend ground high enough to overlook it, and he will see the citadel within to be mere fancy-work, a mere castle of cards, without a foot of solid basis, and without a shot to fire. Nothing but

Digitized by Google

theory is there; and nothing but a rickety agglomeration of facts is before it. Have these any power to shake the mighty bulwarks of Divine truth? They have not power to discompose, for a moment, a single well-informed Christian.

We speak with reference only to Bible subjects. Our remarks touch only such writings, or portions of writings, as affect the Bible's statements. We have no quarrel, and can have none, with any true science; for we find all of it saying only such things as are said or implied by the Bible. All honour to science in itself—to science as consisting of pure fact—to true science even as consolidated into system! All honour also, and gratitude, to as much of real science as exists in the very works of the very sceptics themselves. Some of these works contain vast quantities of facts, collected by great research, exhibited with great skill, and grandly suited in themselves, however unintended by the writers, to illustrate some glorious truths of the Bible; and in so far as any works contain such things, they are works of value. But none the less are the sceptical portions of them worse than worthless; or rather all the more are the portions of them which handle Bible topics without taking the Bible's own statements into account, and which profess to be scientific while they consist mainly of sheer theory—all the more are these both discreditable to the writers, and utterly undeserving the attention of readers. Nothing which ignores the Bible and palms off theory for science is entitled to a hearing on any of the four topics we have named respecting man. We might, therefore, dismiss summarily all adverse arguments on these topics, for the reason that they are radically illogical. But we shall have to make good our

Digitized by Google

assertion that facts are mishandled; we also may be asked to confront some of the chief arguments individually; and we, therefore, shall go a little into detail on each of the four topics.

I. The origin of man. This is announced in Gen. i. 27; "God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them;" and it is further stated in Gen. ii. 7, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." The work was special and Divine, had reference specially to man and was done directly by Deity; and it was both creative and formative. The announcement of it, in the first passage, speaks of man as a creature, exhibits him as a special creation, relates particularly to his soul or mind as made out of nothing, and is narrated as a distinct or separate act, and as the completing act, in the long, grand, progressional series of creational work done by God, by Elohim, by the Almighty; and the statement of it, in the second passage, speaks of man in his relations to the Divine moral government, exhibits him with prospective reference to the scheme of redemption, relates particularly to his body, as made out of the same elements as that of other organic beings, and is narrated as a main act and a commencing one in the intricate, expansive, mediatorial administration over all things on earth by the Lord God, or Elohim Jehovah. Here, then, is a clear, succinct, comprehensive account of the origin of man, in his mind, in his body, and in all his relations.

The sceptics, however, will not accept this account. They object to it on the ground of its exhibiting man as a special creation. They insist that he shall be

Digitized by Google

regarded only as an item, and a sequential one, in a uniform evolutional or developmental process. They will look, as to origin, not at man by himself, but at the world in a mass. The question as to how he came into existence is, in their view, entirely a question as to how the world came into existence, or at best as to how the world is constituted. They shift all inquiry, in the first instance, from man as man to the world as the world, or to creation as creation. But they gain nothing by their tactics. They immediately divide themselves into two camps, the one saying that the world possesses a *vis viva* or self-creating energy, the other saying that it owed something to the implantation in it of primal types of organic being; and they, at the same time, unite in ascribing to itself all the forces whence all existing organic beings sprang; so that, as regards the origination of man, the origination of everything connected with him, the origination of the entire world as it now exists, they exclude all notion of God or of creation, and pronounce the world self-made. The result is either atheism or pantheism. Many things are said by them to make their notions appear scientific; or rather all the things said by them pretend to be scientific; but all, nevertheless, strike directly at the heart of everything religious; all amount practically to the denial either of God's existence or of His personality or will. No religion, no God, is the cry of all; or if not the loud cry, is the louder echo. Who but an atheist or a pantheist can listen to that? Every other man rejects it. Every man who has not choked his own mind's intuitions, or who feels the power of any of the ten thousand evidences everywhere of the Divine existence, rejects the cry, rejects the teachings of it, rejects there-

Digitized by Google

fore what it says about the origin of man. We should travel from our subject were we to go into a confutation of atheism or pantheism; we must simply refer to the multitude of books, to the human soul's inborn cognitions, to the mighty proofs all over earth and sky, which overwhelmingly confute it; and we might, therefore, end here all notice of the position taken by sceptics against the Bible's account of the origin of man. That position amounts to the denial of God's existence, or of His personality or will; and consequently cannot be either philosophical or scientific, either a thing of reason or a thing of fact. Yet the sceptics form extensive defences across their front; they construct these of alleged facts and of inferences thence; they exhibit them in writings of great length, elaboration, and plausibility; they bring with their accounts of them a remarkable amount of research and erudition; and they fairly require that their alleged facts should be treated in a manner of patient and careful examination. But we have already examined them, patiently and carefully, in our chapter on Nature; so that we may now go on to the second topic about Mankind.

II. The antiquity of Man, or the date of his creation. How is this to be understood? The date is popularly taken at 4004 years before the Christian era; but it is set down by most Christian critics at variously or doubtfully 4004, 4245, and 5470 years; and figures throughout the range of chronologists, ancient and modern, on all sorts of archæological data, in no fewer than about one hundred and forty ways from 3616 years to 6174. The Bible is not answerable for any precise date. It merely places man's creation immediately before the end of "the sixth day" of Genesis, and gives the lifetime of

Digitized by Google

Adam and of some of his principal descendants. It says nothing as to the year when "the sixth day" terminated, or as to any sum of years in the series of lifetimes. Any chronology founded upon it is entirely matter of deduction, and has been differently rendered by different great students. The original text as to some of the lifetimes, too, is represented discrepantly and variously by the Samaritan, the Pentateuch, and Josephus. Critics cannot agree in the construction of a chronological system upon it, earlier than the time of Solomon. The Bible, therefore, is not to be held responsible for the fixation of any precise date of man's creation. If geologists should prove that man existed coevally with any number of the animal species which came into being in the latter part of "the sixth day" of Genesis, they would prove only and exactly what the Bible itself states. The fact of man's creation *within* that "day" is the only fact, respecting the *date* of his creation, which the Bible does state; and that is a fact of great significance. Scientific infidels are deprived by it of much of the fancied fruit of their labour in digging into caves and curious corners of the earth; and dogmatizing Christians are warned not to ride too closely their popular hobby of the 4004 years. Yet the aggregate of the lifetimes mentioned in the Bible, from Adam to Noah or to Abraham or to Solomon, manifestly has some maximum limit; and cannot, under our presents lights, be seen to place the creation of Adam much, if at all, earlier than about 5470 years before the Christian era. And we shall, therefore, discuss the subject of man's antiquity with an eye to that date.

Two or three recent able Christian writers, a considerable number of learned archæologists, a large number of distinguished geologists, and the entire body of de-

Digitized by Google

velopmentists and evolutionists, contend for a date of man's origin higher than that which is popularly assigned to the creation of Adam. They differ exceedingly from one another in animus, in aim, in modes of argument, in the sorts of alleged evidence which they advance, and in the opinions which they severally hold as to the time of man's origin. The two or three Christian writers are zealous alike for science and Christianity; but they misunderstand some parts of the geological record, and misread a few passages of Scripture. The archæologists and the geologists have great diversity of motive; and range from Christians who mistakenly regard the Bible as putting no check on the license of theoretic speculation, to deists or atheists who willingly do all they can to bring the Bible into disrepute. The developmentists and the evolutionists have already been sufficiently before us, and may be regarded here as having gone out of sight in the explosion of their theory; but they reappear, on the present question, in the new guise of geologists; and they occupy, in regard to it, the extremest geological ground. An addition of 1000 or 1474 years to the popularly received epoch of the Adamic creation, so as to place the date of the first man at about 5470 years before the Christian era, would probably satisfy the few Christians who think there were men before Adam; the same addition would satisfy some of both the archæologists and the geologists; a moderately larger addition would satisfy others of both the archæologists and the geologists; and no amount of addition consistent with belief in the special creation of man would satisfy the developmentists and the evolutionists. All parties, then, as to the antiquity of man, aside from other questions which some of them bring into connexion with it, are comprisable in

Digitized by Google

three; one who place the antiquity no higher than the present lights on the interpretation of the Bible admit; one who place it no higher than new and possibly obtainable lights on that interpretation might admit; and one who place it they cannot themselves tell how high, but at any rate far higher than any belief either in the Bible as a whole or in its doctrine of the Divine creation of man can admit. All we have to do, therefore, is first to make a few remarks on the opinion of some Christians that there were men before Adam, and then to examine the views of those archæologists and geologists who assign a very high antiquity to man.

The opinion of a few Christians that there were men before Adam is practically the same opinion as that which we shall have to discuss in our subsequent section on the unity of the human race. It differs from that opinion only in the reasons which are pleaded for it, and in the tendencies which it harbours. It appeals to the Bible; it involves misconstruction of some of the Bible's greatest doctrines; it gives a handle to the advocates of a high human antiquity to claim the Bible's sanction to their notions; and it places in a false light some of the geological phenomena to which these men appeal. And, though it entirely sinks or swims with the mere question of the unity of the human race, yet, on account of its own peculiar behaviour, it requires here a brief separate notice.

Now, first, some creatures with an organization closely similar to man's may not impossibly have existed prior to Adam; but, if they did, they were not men, and have left no posterity. The Bible, through all its tissue, and in very numerous express passages, identifies mankind with the descendants of Adam; so that wherever it speaks of men, it necessarily speaks of Adam's descen-

Digitized by Google

dants. Yet it does not mention one in a hundred of the species of considerable animals which God created; and it no more excludes by its silence the possible creation of some quasi-human animal than it excludes the actual creation of the megatherium or the mammoth. An animal organized like man, but not human, was just as possible a creation as man himself; but if such an animal ever existed, he was not created "in the image of God," he wanted a reasonable soul or moral sense, he sprang into being prior to the commencement of the moral administration. Should geologists, therefore, really find remains of a quasi-human creature in deposits older than the Adamic time, they would only add another species to their catalogue of fossils, and would prove no more about man, as to either his antiquity or anything else, than if they found remains of another species of elephas. Again, the Anakim, the Nephilim, the Zamzummim, the Emim, the Canaanites, and some other seemingly peculiar tribes mentioned in the Bible, are set forth by the advocates of pre-Adamic men as the representatives or offspring pre-Adamites. But all these, in every moral aspect, and particularly in some very broad ones, were manifestly amenable to God's moral government, were arraigned and punished as transgressors of God's law, were treated on exactly the same principles as the Antediluvians at the time of Noah; and therefore were indisputably descendants of Adam. Again, the migration of the sons of Adam—of Cain to the land of Nod, and of Enoch to a place where he built a city—is set forth as indication that they found pre-Adamites in the new places, or even that they went to the new places for sake of forming alliances with pre-Adamites. But the history, as regards Cain and Enoch, speaks of migration only;

Digitized by Google

and as regards their posterity, gives not a hint of any pre-Adamite mixture, but treats them throughout as entirely Adamic. The migration of Cain and Enoch points to pre-Adamite men just as fancifully as the dispersion after the flood would point pre-Noahic Antediluvians. Finally, the accounts of man's creation, in Gen. i. 26–28 and Gen. ii. 7, are set forth as accounts of two creations, the first of pre-Adamite men, the second of Adam. But our Lord himself, in Matt. xix. 4 and Mark x. 6, expressly quotes the first account as the account of the creation of Adam and Eve. And the two accounts bear manifest evidence in their face, in their mutual connection, in their respective contexts, and in the several manner in which they name the Deity, that they both and jointly narrate the creation of Adamic man; the first as to his place in the general plan of the universe, the second as to his place under the Divine moral administration. Thus, the opinion, on alleged Scripture authority, that there were men before Adam, rests all on sheer misapprehension or contortion of the plain meaning of the Bible's words.

The opinion that man, in any sense, had a very high antiquity, rests all, in a similar way, on misapprehension or contortion of facts as to time and relics. Time, surely, is a main element in any question of antiquity. But how is time indicated among the advocates of the high antiquity of man? What is their clock? The day we live in may be very cloudy, so as not to allow us a clear glimpse of the sun, yet may be distinct enough to convince us that the present hour is somewhere about twelve. But if the savants say the hour is five, let them show us their clock, or tell us how it is constructed. It points to five, no doubt; but if it be a mere shell, like the empty

Digitized by Google

thing which hangs for show over the door of a clock-maker's shop, it does not command our belief. Or if, not one clock, but many clocks are shown to us; if all have been started, just as they came from the maker's hands, without any reference to the sun, so as to point at all hours or any hours round the entire dial; neither do they command our belief. And if the owners of them were to speak ever so long or loudly in praise of their construction, we still cannot believe them. The shell one is worthless for wanting clock-work; and the many are worthless, both for their disregarding the sun, and for their contradicting one another. And very similar to such clocks are the methods of computation used by the archæologists and geologists for the alleged high antiquity of man. They are formed without regard to the Bible's indications of time; they invert, or turn upside down, some of its great truths respecting man, particularly his pristine perfection of mould, his pristine endowment with language, and his pristine equipment for every purpose of art and science; they are built, not on facts, but on inferences, obscure, far-fetched, variable, and conflicting; and they exhibit results quite as curious as the pointing of many clocks at all hours round the dial—results of all times and of any times, earlier than present interpretation of the Bible admits, from two or three thousand years up to very many millions. An opinion arising out of methods like these does not deserve a moment's notice; and, as observed or treated among the savants themselves, is a mere football, kicked hither and thither over every part of their great playground. Even the very facts connected with the methods, or used for constructing them, are scattered, incoherent, and contradictory, and undergo every diversity and clash

Digitized by Google

and range of interpretation ; insomuch as to be tossed like handballs, up and down, with all sorts of rebound, in variety of play among the learned athletes. Yet as at least the principal facts are exhibited in imposing colours, with much accompaniment of eloquence to draw attention to their alleged value, these require to be separately named and examined.

One fact is that many complicated languages were spoken four thousand years ago ; and that fact is taken to mean that languages were invented by men, were invented very slowly, and were necessarily the outcome of very many thousands of years of human existence. But this alleged meaning of it is a sheer fancy. Man's invention of language is as destitute of evidence as man's very high antiquity. The latter might just as well be set to vouch for the former, as the former to vouch for the latter. The two stand together exactly as two arrant thieves would do, who should vouch for each other's honesty. Man's invention of language is contradicted by at once his lingual organization, his intellectuality, his moral accountability, his mental and moral place in the cosmos, his constitutional necessities and adaptations for social and tribal co-operation, his radical affinities of speech throughout the languages of every land, his oldest traditions everywhere that his faculty of speech was originally a Divine gift, and the express statement of the Bible that the first man, as he came from the hands of his Creator, knew language and could speak it. These are evidences, severally strong, mutually corroborative, and collectively overwhelming, that language was not invented by man ; and they are not gainsaid by a single fact, a single analogy, a single tradition, or by anything but sheer assumption. The argument here for the high

Digitized by Google

antiquity of man, therefore, is *nil.* It is an argument from nothing, and leads to nothing.

A second fact is that there have been great diversities in the size and shape of human skulls; and this is taken to mean that the skulls could have passed from their worst to their best condition only through such a slow and long course of change as must have commenced many thousands of years before the time of Adam. The meaning imposed here is either evolutional, ethnological, or geological, and in each case is false. The notion of an evolutional progress of skulls is simply a fragment of the development theory, already demolished; and, like the rest of that theory, is a mere dream, uncountenanced by a single fact. The notion of an ethnological progress of skulls is overturned by the fact that the oldest obtainable skulls of any one section of mankind, whether Saxon, Celtic, German, Hindoo, Egyptian, Negro, American Indian, or whatever else, are exactly the same as the skulls of the same section of mankind at the present day. The notion of a geological progress of skulls, or of a progress upward in the order of geological formations, rests much on the case of two individual fossil skulls which will afterwards be noticed; but may be dismissed here with the remark, that one of the oldest known fossil skulls, even according to the judgment of the most distinguished evolutionists, is about as fine a one as now lives, and might have been worthy to grace the shoulders of any modern savant. The argument, therefore, from these notions about skulls to the notion of a high human antiquity, is again an argument from nothing to nothing.

A third fact is that the ancient secular records of many peoples, places, or countries point back to dates

Digitized by Google

long before that usually assigned to the creation of Adam. But what are these records worth? They are notoriously fabulous. The only well-informed persons who give any heed to them now are the advocates of high human antiquity; and even these cannot agree among themselves as to how far they are fabulous, and how far credible. Old local records give an antiquity twice or thrice beyond the truth to many of the old towns of England and of other European countries; but, though current and accepted during the many centuries when men's minds were asleep, have all been discarded by modern investigators. Old histories of Southern England, of Wales, of Scotland, and of other territories at the skirts of the quondam Roman empire, give lists of kings and princes backward to times before that empire came into existence; but, though universally believed for ages, and even kept in countenance till a recent period by adoption of their materials into new compilations, have all been exploded by modern research. A good or true history of any of these countries now, as for example Burton's "History of Scotland," through its entire treatment of the reputedly ancient periods, consists of little less than the rendering of them into nothingness or absurdity. Now, except for containing some credible material somewhat further back, the old histories of Rome, Greece, Persia, Assyria, India, China, and Egypt, on which the advocates of high antiquity rely mainly for their deductions, are not a whit better than the old histories of the countries of Western Europe. They have the same marks of falsehood; they are pervaded by the same spirit of fable; nay, they so abound in palpable romance, in manifest impossibilities, in outrageous mythologies, as to present a warp of falsehood

Digitized by Google

and a woof of fable throughout every yard of their texture. They bear the stamp of fiction on their face. Sceptics having an end to serve, or enthusiasts whirled away by imagination, are the only men of any learning who can stoop to believe them ; and no three of these can agree as to the amount of antiquity which they shall be held to vouch. How, for example, do they treat Egypt? That is their strongest, largest, most boasted example ; it affords them at once monuments, inscriptions, and bits of ancient history ; it affords them these in such plenty, or in such connections, as to have enabled them to construct a sort of science about it, called Egyptology ; and it is held by them to be quite sufficient of itself to settle the whole question of the high antiquity of man. How, then, do three of the most eminent of them expound it as to the date of man's origin. Lepsius places the first Pharaoh 2093 years before the Christian era, Boekh places him 5857 years before it, Bunsen places him about midway between these dates ; and the last gives a latitude of from 6000 to 9000 years for the duration of the Egyptian kingdom, and leaps thence to 20,000 years as "a fair starting-point in the earth's history." Their whole "science," even in their own hands, is a play of guesses ; and, what is more remarkable still, it rests chiefly for its dates on a chronology, the chronology of Manetho, which reads like a riddle, and has not a single voucher. Would a burlesque like this, in any trial, on any question, in any court, be admitted as evidence? Small investigation has sufficed to reduce the ancient histories of Persia, Assyria, India, and China to a moderate chronology ; no investigation at all, but only a fair attention to what themselves say, has sufficed to make the ancient histories

Digitized by Google

of Greece and Rome more modern than those of Persia and Assyria; and not much consideration suffices to fix the commencement of Egyptian history at a goodly period subsequent to the Noahic flood. The antiquity of man, as exhibited in any well-considered ancient history, except that in the Bible, cannot be traced higher than to the times of Noah.

A fourth fact is that there are many ancient monuments, showing high civilization at periods very long before the Christian era; and that fact is taken to mean that many thousands of years must have passed, in order to the engendering and maturing of the civilization. But the meaning imposed here is exactly parallel to the meaning imposed on the fact that there were many ancient languages. Let the monuments of Egypt be selected as an example. These, like the ancient histories of Egypt, are the strongest, largest, most boasted example; yet, as will be shown in the fourth section of this chapter, they prove simply and solely that men of the early generations, or men primevally, were endowed with all powers requisite for art and science. These men's organic conformation, their intellectuality, their necessities and adaptations for mutual co-operation, their history all downward to the present day, and the account which the Bible gives of the first man and of his immediate posterity, combine to prove that they were so endowed. The Egyptian monuments, whether architectural, sculptural, pictorial, or hieroglyphic, say nothing else and nothing more. The savants allege otherwise; but they give no proofs, and cannot give any. They allege that the civilization exhibited by the monuments was a slow growth upward from barbarism; they allege that the slow growth must have consumed, at the least,

Digitized by Google

6700 years; and they have no more to say. They neither explain how the civilization appears, all at once, full-blown on the monuments; nor exhibit any course of it, either in Egypt or in any other land, running onward from barbarism in perennial progress. They simply make an assumption that civilized men were very remote descendants of savage men, and infer thence that the savage men existed long before the time of Adam. Their argument consists in begging one question to buy another; or it is, once more, an argument from nothing to nothing.

A fifth fact is that remains exist of villages, alleged to be from 6000 or 7000 to 100,000 years old, originally built on piles in lakes. Some of these are in Scotland, and some in Ireland, but the chief are in Switzerland. All have one manner of construction, widely different from that of every other kind of villages, and supposed of itself to prove their very high antiquity. But villages of precisely the same kind figure in history as inhabited in Thrace and Macedonia only 520 years before the Christian era, can be proved to have been inhabited in Ireland so late as the year A.D. 1567, and are traceable as inhabited in some other countries almost till the present day; while villages similar to them, or of similar construction, still exist in New Guinea, South America, and Australia. But articles found in those of Switzerland are adduced as further or separate evidence of high antiquity. These comprise celts, hammers, hatchets, bronze articles, fishing-gear, bark, twigs, bits of twine, bits of nets, bits of linen, fragments of rude pottery, specimens of wheat, barley, apples, pears, plums, and traces of fifty-four species of animals. What evidence of high antiquity is here? Many a dust-heap in a

Digitized by Google

modern city could furnish nearly as much. The celts and tools and rude pottery certainly indicate low civilization, but not more so than do the implements and utensils of savages of the present day. The twine and nets and linen, formed of fibre which must have been obtained by culture and worked by art, utter no other voice in regard to time than is uttered by the twine and nets and linen of any modern period. The species of animals alone give a distinct voice; for one of them, and only one, is now extinct; but that one is the urus, and it did not become extinct till long after the time of Cæsar. The utmost, therefore, which can be inferred respecting the date of these boasted Swiss lake villages, is that they were built or inhabited in the times when the urus lived, or times which ranged into the Christian era.

A sixth fact is that there are, on the coast of Denmark, kjökken-möddings or refuse-heaps seemingly of high antiquity. They occur near the shore, in tracts where men may anciently have lived; they vary from 3 to 10 feet in height, from 150 to 200 feet in width, and from 100 to 300 yards in length; they contain flint implements, stone hatchets, fragments of rude pottery, shells of several species of molluscs, and bones of numerous species of quadrupeds and birds; and they are adduced to prove man's high antiquity by several different arguments. One of these is that they could have been formed only by many successive generations of men, and that therefore they were commenced by some men at a period beyond the range of the received chronology. But they may not have been formed by men at all; they could have been formed as well by the shifting action of wind and water, common to the kind of low changeful shore on which they lie; and one or two of

Digitized by Google

them have rough strata of sand and gravel, which could scarcely have been due to any sort of human action. A second argument is that the rude implements and rude pottery in them indicate the men around them to have been savages, and therefore to have lived in very ancient times. Do the rude implements and rude pottery of the savages of the present day indicate *them* to be living in very ancient times? A third argument is that oyster shells are in them, that oysters are not now found in the neighbouring seas, and that therefore the organic relics in the heaps must belong to a very ancient period. But oysters were far from rare in the neighbouring seas so late as the latter part of last century. A fourth argument is that parts of the Danish west coast which have been subject to sea-abrasion want "refuse-heaps" on their existing land, yet may be presumed to have had them on their lost land, and that therefore the parts of the north coast which still have them must have acquired them in very ancient times. But large portions of the north coast have not suffered any sea-abrasion, and yet have no "refuse-heaps." And, on the other hand, many parts of the American coast, all the way from Prince Edward's Island to Georgia, have "refuse-heaps" similar to the Danish ones; with the peculiarity, too, that oyster-shells are in them, while oysters in the neighbouring seas are now extremely scarce. A fifth argument, greatly more feasible than all the other four taken together, rests on the fact that bones of the urus, an animal now extinct, are in the Danish heaps. But that argument is the same as the strongest one from the Swiss lake villages, and does no more than show that the heaps were formed within times which extended long subsequent to the time of Cæsar.

Digitized by Google

A seventh fact is the existence of respectively stone, bronze, and iron implements at successive depths of bogs in Denmark and Ireland. These bogs are sometimes 30 or 40 feet deep; they have successive strata of successively different kinds of fallen trunks of forest trees; they appear to have grown slowly, under successive falls of successive forests; and as they contain implements of successively stone, bronze, and iron correlatively to their successive strata of different kinds of tree-trunks, they have been made the basis of an archæological system of human epochs, called the stone, the bronze, and the iron ages, commencing in a very remote antiquity. But, first, this system makes precisely the same baseless assumption as three of the arguments we formerly dealt with—that man's original state was a savage one; and, therefore, like these three other arguments, it begs one question to buy another, or is an argument from nothing to nothing. Next, the system, though still flaunted by shallow periodicalists and careless compilers as if it were a thing universally accepted, is now very greatly modified or entirely discarded by all careful archæologists. Next, the growth of bogs has been proved, by many exact observations, to be exceedingly more rapid than the system assumes. Next, the different kinds of trees observed to be successive in some bogs, are observed to be contemporaneous in others. Next, stone, bronze, and iron implements are proved, by credible history, to have been used contemporaneously by the Egyptians, by the Persians, and by the Greeks. Next, the traditions of the ancient nations ran, not in the lines of stone, bronze, and iron ages, but in the lines of gold, silver, and iron ages. Next, some cuttings in Irish bogs have yielded at once gold ornaments, bronze battle-axes, and stone

Digitized by Google

arrow-heads. Next, an excavation at Linhope, in Northumberland, made in 1863, yielded conjointly articles of glass, pottery, iron, bronze, and stone. Finally, Danish forts in Ireland have been found to contain the same sort of implements of stone and bronze as those in the systematized bogs of Denmark, and yet cannot date earlier than the Danish invasion in A.D. 827. What then is the alleged fact about stone, bronze, and iron ages? Simply a ludicrous flourish about the antiquity of man, in imbecile opposition to real facts about his comparatively modern origin.

An eighth fact is that, in 1854, bits of burnt brick and pottery were found by borings in the alluvium of the Nile, at depths of from 60 to 72 feet, and computed by the finders of them to have been deposited there at some period about 11,517 years before the Christian era. This fact made a great sensation for a few years; and the computation founded on it, not only was accepted readily by all advocates of high human antiquity, but was augmented by some of them to 58,000 years. Most of them now, however, seem to be ashamed of it; and no wonder. The bits of brick were ascertained to be Roman! Nor only that, but a brick, afterwards found at a greater depth, bears the stamp of Mohammed Ali! The sensation raised among the savants was suddenly quashed by the question, "How long would a brick require to sink 60 feet into a quagmire?" The Nile's mud, in many a place, is sheer quagmire, and could swallow a brick to a considerable depth at a single inundation. The bits of Roman brick 11,517 or 58,000 years old in the Roman times, are a fine specimen of facts for the high antiquity of man. They serve to show how the savants are open to be hoaxed by themselves

Digitized by Google

or by one another; and they save us the trouble of examining, or naming, some other facts of a closely similar kind.

A ninth fact is the existence of relics in alluvial deposits at elevations above the present adjacent water-levels; and this is taken to prove that the relics are of very high antiquity. The chief instances adduced are one of canoes in the valley of the Clyde, and one of a human lower-jawbone in the valley of the Meuse. Sixteen canoes were found beneath Glasgow or its neighbourhood, in years from 1780 till 1854, at various elevations above present high-water level in the Clyde up to 22 feet; and had a conformation or accompaniments indicative of savagism in the men who made them. The savagism here, oddly enough, is not made the ground of argument; but the elevatedness of the position is. How was that caused? and what amount of antiquity does it indicate? These are questions for geologists to answer, and are answered by them variously. The elevating cause is thought to have been either earthquake, water-wave, plutonic upheaval, or both; and the time when it occurred is set down at dates from A.D. 1266 to A.M. 2513. The case, therefore, be it taken how it may, goes entirely against the theory of a high antiquity of man. Nor is the other case much different. The human jawbone was found at Maestricht, in the alluvial deposit called the loess, at a depth of 60 feet; but manifestly appears to have got there, not by direct deposit, but by strongly sweeping drift. The loess lies in all the valleys radiating from the Alps, downward from altitudes of no less than 1500 feet; it presents the same characters as the bluffs or sweepings of a great many rivers; and it may have been the product of either

Digitized by Google

the action of glaciers, the fall of avalanches, the inundation of streams, the bursting of lakes, or the combined action of two or more of these causes and of one or more of others. The age of anything found in it, therefore, cannot be determined in the least by the materials, the relative position, or the local depth anywhere of the loess, but must be determined solely by the character of the thing itself. The detached human bone found embedded in it may have been no older than a detached human bone found embedded under the *débris* of an avalanche, or under the tumulus of a landslip, or within the bar of a tidal river; and as that bone resisted disintegration or decomposition by the forces which tore it away from its fellow bones, it is as likely as not to have been no older than a very few centuries.

A tenth fact is the existence of relics in high raised beaches; and this also is taken to mean that the relics are of very high antiquity. The most remarkable instance is that of pieces of pottery in a beach in the south of Sardinia, now 300 feet above the present sea-level. The computation here is made on what geologists call the uniformitarian hypothesis—that the rate of geognostic changes anywhere in past times has been the same as the rate of geognostic changes anywhere now; and it takes the rate of the upheaval of the Sardinian coast as the rate of the observed current upheaval of the Scandinavian coast, or 2½ feet in a century. The pieces of pottery, accordingly, are pronounced to be 12,000 years old. But, first, the uniformitarian hypothesis is held by only one of the three schools of geologists, and is stoutly repudiated by the other two. Next, that hypothesis reasons in such a manner about the raised beaches of Great Britain as to conclude that, if any

Digitized by Google

human relic were found on them, it would be from 60,000 to 100,000 years old ; and as fragments of Roman pottery, accompanied by bones of a ruminant have been found in a raised beach 25 feet high at Leith, it would pronounce these to have been the work of the Romans from 55,000 to 95,000 years before the Romans existed. Next, the elevation of the north coast of Asia, still going on, has lifted the sea-bottom to the breadth of about 480 miles since the year A.D. 1266, so as to strand whales and ships at points now hundreds of miles inland from the present shore ; and that, on the uniformitarian hypothesis' own method of computation, would show the Sardinian pieces of pottery to be not more than probably about 600 years old. And, next, without quoting any more instances of coast upheaval, the possible rapidity of the agency in any of them is well illustrated by a case of inland upheaval. The elevation of part of a level tract in America into the mountain Jorullo 1681 feet high, occurred in a single day of last century ; yet, according to the rate of computation assumed for the pottery beach of Sardinia, would have required 67,000 years !

An eleventh fact is that many flint implements, associated with bones of the rhinoceros, the elephant, the hyæna, and other animals now existing only in low latitudes, have been found in gravels of high latitudes ; and this is taken to mean that human fabricators of the implements existed in times prior to those climatic conditions of the earth which belong to the Adamic epoch. A number of places, both in England and on the Continent, have been discussed in connection with these implements ; but the valley of the Somme around Abbeville in France, is the most prominent, and may be con-

Digitized by Google

sidered as representing them all. The discussions on that place have been very voluminous, very confident, and not a little conflicting; and as to all their bearing on the alleged high antiquity of man, they turn on the questions whether or not the implements are artificial, whether or not they were deposited in the juxtapositions in which they were found, whether or not the gravels or strata about them have been dislocated or disturbed by plutonic action, and whether or not a human jawbone found among them belongs to their own age. Now, many of the alleged implements are manifestly not artificial; and thousands of the others are impositions swindled into the soil by local cheats, to meet a market demand for them since the cry of high human antiquity was raised; but some must be frankly admitted to be ancient. Again, these ancient or genuine ones are more likely to have been dropped into the positions where they were found than to have been originally deposited there; for, had they been originally deposited there, they would almost certainly have been accompanied by human bones, or by relics of human habitation or of human textile art. Farther, the gravels or strata about them are admitted, by even the stoutest advocates of high human antiquity who have written respecting them, to show signs or to have connexion with signs of oscillation of level; and may be clearly argued to have undergone, not gentle oscillation only, but very considerable disturbance; so that they do not now indicate when or how the implements were dropped into them, but permit these to take rank with all other tools of that "stone age" which we have already shown to be comparatively modern. Finally, the human jawbone got in the gravels was a great find for the savants, welcomed gladly for a

Digitized by Google

time, and serving opportunely, as they thought, to break the neck of the objection as to the implements being unaccompanied by human bones; but it was eventually proved, through application of chemical tests, to be quite modern, or even recent; and it was then denounced as a cheat, thrust into the soil by some of the impostors who had been fabricating imitations of the flint implements. But even as a cheat, it was quite as good a thing as the bits of Roman brick found in the mud of the Nile and pronounced to have been 11,517 years old at the Christian era; and it serves to show, as these did, how open the advocates of high humanity are to a thorough hoax.

A twelfth fact is the discovery of a human skeleton, alleged to be 50,000 years old, at a depth of 16 feet, beneath soil containing stumps of four successive cypress forests, at the site of the gas-works of New Orleans. The computation here is that the delta of the Mississippi, beneath and around New Orleans, required 100,000 years for its growth; that the soil containing the remains of four cypress forests required 50,000 years for its accumulation; and that, therefore, the human skeleton could not be less than 50,000 years old. But, first, the ground on which New Orleans stands, down to the depth of 40 feet, was calculated, on good data, by the United States army engineers, to have been all deposited within 4400 years. And next, the deposition of mud and humus still goes on so rapidly along the sides of the river as sometimes to amount to two or three feet around the stems of cotton-wood saplings before they are seven years old, and as to cover stumps of full-grown trees to their summits before they have time to decay. Hence the date of the human skeleton, as fixed by the character of

Digitized by Google

the soil found over it, must be placed no higher than between 1000 and 2000 years, and may possibly be less than 1000.

A thirteenth fact is the alleged discovery of a human skull in California, 300 feet beneath the surface of the ground, below lava, close to petrified oak and rhinoceros teeth, with evidence of belonging to the post-Pliocene age. A discussion on it occurred at Chicago in August, 1868, at a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; and elicited both the argument from the skull for high human antiquity, and three several lines of reply to extinguish the argument. Gentlemen familiar with the alleged discovery, and with the locality of it, denied the authenticity of the finding; several eminent geologists, even on the assumption that the skull was genuine, repelled the inference which was attempted to be drawn from it; and Professor Hungerford pronounced the evidence to be cumulative, expressed a belief "that a great deal of all that had been written and said upon the subject of the antiquity of man would go for zero," and, glancing at a thought which we purpose to notice further on, added, "Granting the existence of human remains contemporaneously with the remains of extinct mammals, it is to be remembered that it is to be considered, Do the extinct mammals actually come down nearer to the present epoch than we have supposed, or does the existence of the human race extend further back than we have hitherto supposed?" The Californian skull did not go for much among these savants. It was a hoax with some, a modern thing with others, a thing geologically high yet chronologically low with others. And even if it be allowed full credit for the position in which it is alleged to have been found, it will, after all,

Digitized by Google

take rank only with the jawbone of the loess and the flint implements of the Somme, which also were found adjacent to rhinoceros bones, and with other comparatively modern relics yet to be noticed, which likewise have been found in similar position.

A fourteenth fact is the discovery in 1833 of a human skull, accompanied with a rhinoceros tooth and with bones of several mammals, in a cave at Engis, about eight miles south-west of Liege. The position in which the skull was found and the objects adjacent to it are not made the ground of much or any argument; but the skull itself has been regarded as affording evidence, in its own conformation, of being pre-Adamic. It has a proximate occipital flattening rarely seen in modern European skulls, and wants any salient character which might relegate it to some one of the distinctive present sections of the human race; and therefore has been held to belong to some human being who was of prior date to the ancestors of any existing European people. But even granting all the premises assumed about it to be true, they go no further than to place it before the time when distinctive peculiarities, ranging them into distinctive sections, began to be common; so that, instead of proving the high antiquity of man, they prove merely the original unity of the human race. The skull thus serves another purpose altogether than what the savants wish; it serves to damage their theory of a plurality of human races. Not only so, but it serves likewise to damage their other theory of the early condition of mankind having been a savage condition; for, by the admission of some of the ablest anatomists among themselves, it is a very good skull in both size and shape, quite worthy of comparison with their own grand skulls.

Digitized by Google

A fifteenth fact is the discovery in 1857 of a queer human skull, unaccompanied with anything to indicate its age, at Neanderthal, near Dusseldorf, about seventy miles north-east of Engis. This skull, as compared with the average of human skulls, is both of small size and of abnormal shape. A great effort was made by some developmentists to claim it as an intermediate thing between monkey and man; but that effort was a forlorn hope, and was soon abandoned. An effort was next made, and continues to be made, to claim it as an evidence both of man's high antiquity and of his having originally been a savage. But nothing is shown either in its own conformation or in the circumstances in which it was found to place it earlier than the Christian era; nor is anything apparent in it, or about it, to identify it more with savages than with civilized men. It possibly may not be more than a few centuries old; and it is worse than some savage skulls, and better than some civilized ones. Its capacity is 75 cubic inches; while that of the highest gorilla skull is 34½, that of some Hindoo skulls 40, that of some English skulls 55, and that of the largest English skulls 114. Some lowest type of skull from a modern English cemetery, if but found in a solitary place, away from association with other skulls, would have served the savants' purpose much better. Even the founder and president of the Anthropological Society said respecting it, "The important observations of Dr. Bernard Davis respecting the synostotic condition of this fragment bid fair to solve the question, by showing that the Neanderthal skull is merely an abnormal relic, and that all the theories founded thereon as to the extreme savage state of the primitive inhabitants of Europe are utterly worthless."

Digitized by Google

And the same conclusion follows as to the theory of high antiquity.

A sixteenth fact is the existence of bone caves in various parts of England and of the Continent. This might be magnified into numerous facts—into facts as numerous as the individual caves, or as numerous even as the diversities in their situation and their contents; but, for every purpose of argument, it is practically no more than one fact. Vastly voluminous matter has been written about it; distributing it into thousands of particles, and tossing them up like a cloud of dust, with every particle suited to fall upon the eye; yet it needs not to be examined in detail, but can all be treated as a single mass. The caves, though very various in at once position, configuration, and contents, have all one character in their relation to the theory of high human antiquity, or are all adduced in support of it simply on the ground of their containing human relics in juxtaposition with bones of the rhinoceros, the elephant, the hyæna, the cave-bear, the brown bear, the wild cat, the wild boar, the wolf, the roe-deer, the reindeer, the polecat, the hedgehog, the water-rat, the chamois, the sheep, the goat, the ox, and the horse. The human relics in most of them are implements only, but in some are bones also. The brute relics differ much as to both kind and collocation in the different caves; but those of the rhinoceros, the elephant, the hyæna, and the cave-bear characterize them generally, and are the things most wanted for the antiquity theory. Now, first, the juxtaposition of the human relics with the brute ones occurs never under stronger conditions, but generally under weaker ones, than in the gravels noticed in our paragraph on the "eleventh fact;" so that, here as there, it says

Digitized by Google

nothing for the high antiquity of the human relics. Again, various indications exist in the configuration of the caves, in their position relatively to the tracts around them, and in the mutual contiguities of the objects within them, that the several kinds or classes of the relics which they contain were deposited in result of successive catastrophes or other great changes, which may have been very distant in time of occurrence from one another. Again, the strongest indication presented in any of them that their contents have been very long undisturbed, is much too weak to serve as an index of any considerable antiquity; for though a floor of stalagmite lies over all the relics in some of them, and has been earnestly pleaded as evidence of great age, even that, in cases of constant copious drippings from fissured limestone roof, may have been the result of not more than one or two centuries. Further, the very mixture or contiguity of relics belonging to widely different present climates, as of bones of the rhinoceros and the beaver, bones of the elephant and the polecat, bones of the hyæna and the hedgehog, is evidence either that there was no contemporaneity in the deposits, or that some extensive cataclysm, of a kind to effect a collapse of widely different climates into one climate, was the cause of the contemporaneity. Finally, will the savants explain to us the cause or origin of the diluvial and glacial phenomena which they describe as intervening between the post-Pliocene age and the Adamic or modern age? They cannot do so; they can give only vague and conflicting conjectures respecting that cause; they have not one distinct idea as to what it really was; they know simply that it altered previous conditions of being, but did not itself produce any new species of being; and yet they

Digitized by Google

depict it as a nexus, a conjunctive thing, an interfusing force between the post-Pliocene age and the modern age, and at the same time assign to its existence or operation a long separate period of duration. What inconsistency is here! Let them interpret it entirely by its phenomena, and they will cease to quote the bone-caves as any proof of the high antiquity of man.

A seventeenth fact is the discovery in 1852 of a burial-cave at Aurignac in the south of France. This cave is much more important than any one of the bone-caves, and yet does not yield an atom of argument for high human antiquity. Principal Forbes says, "It was a natural rock-cave or recess, of no great extent, closed artificially by a vertical slab of stone. Within it were the remains of (it is believed) seventeen human beings, mostly in a sitting posture, according to the usage of the rudest nations. They were intermixed with works of art in flint and bone, and with undoubted bones of extinct species of the greater quadrupeds. Outside the stone portal similar bones of the lower animals occurred, many of them split up in the manner employed by savages for the extraction of marrow; but these were intermixed with no human relics, though accompanied with evident marks of fire. The whole tells one consistent story; viz., that at a period when the south of France supported the mammoth, the Siberian rhinoceros, cave-lion, and hyæna, the reindeer and the bisòn, families of men dwelt in these countries, supported themselves by the chase of these very animals, buried their dead as the Red Indian now does surrounded with his weapons and his hunting-spoils, and that the relics of the feast after the funeral still remained outside the tomb for the inspection of ethnologists of the nineteenth century. The

Digitized by Google

completeness of the interfusion of the historic with the last geologic age is curiously completed by the fact that the relics of domestic animals—the horse, ass, and pig, all existing species, and of human date—are indiscriminately mixed with those of the elephantine period. It seems very improbable that such a tomb transcends in antiquity the limits usually assigned to historic records. Clearly no considerable geological change has happened in the valley where it occurs; for the entrance to the cave was covered only by turf and a little gravel through which a rabbit had worked a passage which occasioned the discovery of the tomb. Outside of the stone portal were lying beds of ashes, burned and gnawed bones, and other transportable relics, which a moving force of the slightest kind must at once have dislodged. As an argument of mere general probability, no one would be disposed to assign to such a place of aboriginal sepulture an antiquity of more than two or three thousand years. It appears to us to afford an argument altogether in favour of the comparatively modern date of the disappearance of the mammoth."

An eighteenth fact, and the last we shall name, is that relics of man are found in various deposits or positions which contain bones of the mammoth, the mastodon, the woolly rhinoceros, the cave-bear, and other extinct animals of the post-Pliocene age. We are now at the climax of the arguments for the high antiquity of man; and we ask the geological savants to make the most of it, and to tell us what that comes to. They, of course, assert that it proves men to have lived in the post-Pliocene age; and, when requested to set down some date for that age, they probably will not agree to set it down at less than 100,000 years before the Christian era. But first,

Digitized by Google

as already noticed, the post-Pliocene age and the Adamic age, as represented in the geological systems, are bridged together, or fused into each other, by diluvial and glacial phenomena, amounting to nothing more than change of climatic conditions; so that computation respecting their mutual relations would be done as legitimately by carrying the former onward into the latter as by carrying the latter backward into the former. Why not, therefore, say that the post-Pliocene animals in question were prolonged into the Adamic age, rather than say that men came into being in the post-Pliocene age? The parties who say the former can give good reasons, both in fact and from Scripture; while the geologists who say the latter can give no reason except their own mere theory, and at the same time are opposed by other geologists who pronounce the theory unsound. Again, the post-Pliocene animals whose remains are found contiguous to human relics, are proved, by the wide diffusion of their bones, to have lived throughout extensive regions now under great diversity of climate; so that, as they had adaptations to only a limited range of climate, many individuals of them may be presumed to have migrated from country to country as change of climatic conditions went on, and so to have perpetuated their several species into the Adamic times.

Again, no fewer than about forty extinct species of mammals and birds became extinct within the historic period, some of them so late as after the close of the eighteenth century; so that other extinct species also, including all on which the argument for high human antiquity is founded, may have become extinct only since the date commonly assigned to the creation of Adam. Again, the extinction of species which lived

Digitized by Google

immediately precurrent to the appearance of man, did not necessarily follow altogether the same law as the extinction of the species which were peculiar to the secondary and the tertiary periods. It is assumed by the argument for high human antiquity to have taken place, as that of these did, solely in consequence of geognostic changes or of cosmical gradation; but it really was due in part, and may have been due very largely, to an entirely new force. Man came upon the scene; and as man ever onward to the present day has been restricting the range and terminating the existence of very many species of animals, so may he, at an early period of his migrations, have been the extinguisher of some. Hence, the datum of contemporaneity in the relics of man and the bones of extinct animals, instead of carrying man back into a previous age of these animals, may carry these animals forward into the Adamic age. The main mass of the great species, as the mammoth, the mastodon, and the woolly rhinoceros, may be presumed to have fallen under the weight of the diluvial and glacial changes which went on; but not a few straggling individuals may equally be presumed to have lived through these changes, and fallen finally under the hand of man. Again, the fossil bones of these great species, in many instances, are found broken, and also were a very likely material to be adopted by primitive men for the constructing of various kinds of implements. And no more probable reason can be suggested for their being found broken than that they were broken by men for some implemental purpose. And if so, either they were got in a fossil state, as remains of the defunct chief mass of the species, or they were got by the hunting down of straggling survivors, few and scattered enough to be safely attacked in the chase.

Digitized by Google

Again, the computation of time backward from the popular date of the creation of Adam to the concluding point or any point in the post-Pliocene period, cannot be clearly done for even a single step ; and, in so far as it has been attempted to be done, has been attempted, from end to end, through dense obscurity. The mere contiguity of human relics and mammoth remains say nothing to it ; for that is a mere common graveyard, with not a tombstone to show a date, and lies amid surroundings as indiscriminate and unreadable as the graveyard itself. Nor do signs of upheaval or of subsidence say anything to it ; for these neither show when the phenomena occurred nor indicate the date of the deposits which were affected. Nor do diluvial drifts or glacial sediments or filled-up caves say anything to it ; for they give no indication as to when the floods, or other agencies concerned with them, occurred, or as to how long these lasted. Nor, as we have already seen, does the extinction of species say anything to it ; for that, as a ground of computation of time, is practically neither more nor less than the very computation itself, and amounts simply to saying that the date is so because it is so. Nothing whatever brings out any date, except a vague conjecture on the footing of the uniformitarian hypothesis ; and that, by even such an extreme advocate of high antiquity as Herbert Spencer in his "Illogical Geology," is condemned as utterly worthless. A shaft-sinker's stare into a hole which may happen to open under his feet exactly resembles a geologist's stare into the time-tunnel backward from the date usually assigned to the creation of Adam. A hole suddenly opened at the foot of a deep shaft in the recent explorations adjacent to the Temple wall at Jerusalem, and was pro-

Digitized by Google

nounced to be "the bottomless pit," but proved, on being plumbed, to be only six feet deep. And so the time-tunnel, pronounced by the savants to be 100,000 years or more long from the Christian era, may prove, after all, to be not much longer, or no longer at all, than the popularly received 4004 years.

Again, the extinct megatherium, megalonyx, scelidotherium, and mylodon, enormous quadrupeds of the post-Pliocene age, inhabiting the Pampean plains of South America, are believed by eminent geologists to have been brought to extinction by climatic conditions which still exist—especially by great periodical droughts, such as, so lately as the years 1829 and 1830, made terrible havoc among the cattle on the finest pastures. The bones of these creatures, too—particularly those of the megatherium—are found on the very surface of the soil, insomuch as to be used by the natives for fire-places; and they could not possibly have lain there undecomposed, in such a climate, during many millenniums.

Why, then, may not the other great animals of the post-Pliocene age—the mammoth, the mastodon, the woolly rhinoceros, and the cave-bear—also have lived till a recent period? Again, two other large extinct animals of the post-Pliocene age, the wild bull or urus and the great Irish deer, also were brought to extinction under existing climatic conditions, and not till a comparatively modern time. And why, as compared with them likewise, may not the mammoth, the mastodon, the woolly rhinoceros, and the cave-bear, have lived till a recent period? Again, the mastodon, even apart from comparison with any other species, and entirely on its own evidence, appears to have survived into the Christian times. A specimen of it, found in a bog at Newbury in

Digitized by Google

the state of New York, and preserved in a museum at Boston, exhibited remarkable freshness in its bones when taken from the bog, and retained in its stomach five or six bushels of masticated twigs in a state of excellent preservation. No man who looks at even the chewed fibres which were taken from among its teeth, unless he be under some delusion which blinds or perverts his senses, will assign to the death of that animal a date earlier than the commencement of the Christian era.

Again, the mammoth also, quite apart from comparison with any other species, and entirely on its own evidence, appears to have survived into the Christian times. A specimen of it, found in 1804 at the mouth of the Lena in Siberia, though previously mangled and mutilated by wild beasts, was in a state of completeness and freshness almost as great as if it had been dead for only a few years. The skin was still on it, covered with tufts of black hair and reddish wool; the top of the neck was still furnished with a flowing mane; the head was still enveloped in a dry scalp; the brain, though dried up, still occupied the cranium; the balls of the eyes were still distinguishable; one of the ears, with a tuft or mane on it, was in good preservation; ligaments and portions of skin still connected the spine and great bones with remains of the limbs; the flesh over its body was still so fresh and full that the Yakoutskes of the neighbourhood cut it off to feed their dogs; the entire carcase was so heavy that ten persons were scarcely able to carry it; and more than thirty pounds of hair and wool, which white bears had taken from it while devouring other portions of its flesh, were found in its vicinity. The skeleton of it, in a state not very far from entire, is preserved in a museum at St. Petersburg. Other specimens,

Digitized by Google

as full and fresh as this was, or probably more so, are, with good reason, believed to exist on the Siberian coast. And an American one, found on the roadside trench of the old Tescuco road, is computed, on good grounds, to have been hunted to death by the Indians not very long before the Spanish conquest. Again, a great many mammoths, European rhinoceroses, and their contemporaries, in the tracts adjacent to the Polar sea, appear to have perished no longer ago than from six to three centuries. Not only vast quantities of bones of them, but great numbers of entire, or almost entire, skeletons of them, are known to lie entombed there in the ice. The molar teeth of a rhinoceros, preserved in a private English collection of fossils, retains half-chewed seeds and pine leaves. And a great change of climate, competent to have converted herds of the mammoths and the rhinoceroses into the fossils now existing in the ice, seems clearly to have been concurrent with that extensive elevation of sea-bottom along Siberia and Greenland which went on from about the year A.D. 1266 to about the year A.D. 1570.

Again, some species of animals, believed by geologists to have been long extinct, were recently reported to be still alive in some nooks of Palestine. And the authority for the report, though we quote only from memory, was good authority, and went on to suggest that, in spots of abnormal climate, and lying out of the lines of ordinary research, such as various sequestered spots in Palestine, may not improbably be found to contain living specimens of other species set down in geological systems as long extinct. And either the survival of megatheriums, mastodons, mammoths, or any of their great contemporaries to the Adamic times, much more to the Christian

Digitized by Google

times, or especially the survival of any reputedly extinct post-Pliocene species to the present day, completely upsets the geological argument for high human antiquity, turns upside down the whole basis on which the argument rests, destroys altogether the geological computation of time from which it pretends to find dates. Finally, a discovery was made in the autumn of 1869, by means of very deep soundings in the North Atlantic, done by Drs. Carpenter and Thomson in a royal British warship, that, in certain depressions of the sea-bottom, there still exist living specimens of the Cretaceous period. And this discovery breaks to pieces, and grinds to powder, the whole geological clock. If the savants take the mammoth at a hundred thousand years before the Christian era, they are likely to take the Cretaceous fauna at not less than from twenty to fifty millions, or even more. Yet here is a discovery which annihilates all these millions of years, and links the time of the Chalk with the times in which we ourselves live. The savants have found human relics in contiguity with relics of the mammoth, and therefore have said that man lived about a hundred thousand years ago; and should they ever find human relics in contiguity with fauna of the chalk, they must also say that men lived from twenty to fifty millions of years ago. They have already said some queer things, and still get persons to listen to them; but if they shall say that, they will not get a listener any more. Their clock gives the date of the extinction of the mammoth as about a hundred thousand years before the Christian era, while facts give it as within the Christian times. Their clock also gives the date of the extinction of the Cretaceous fauna as from twenty to fifty millions of years ago; while facts

Digitized by Google

give it as not having occurred yet. Away with that crazy clock! And away goes with it the entire absurdity about a high antiquity of man.

The notion of high human antiquity, then, amounts to nothing more than mere theory; and, in some aspects of it, is theory, dark, dreamy, and wild. Nor is the theory coherent or consistent; but it breaks into numerous small pieces, separately held by separate schools of archæologists, and into three larger pieces, separately held by separate schools of geologists. The separate pieces, too, are not harmonious, but all more or less discordant, and some of them directly conflicting. The separate schools agree only in the round assertion that human antiquity was high, but disagree utterly as to how the assertion is to be defended, and as to the amount of antiquity which is to be pleaded. The main ones also, or the three geological, impugn one another's reasonings, and pronounce one another to be radically wrong. Were a paper written out, placing in parallel columns the dicta of the several schools, or much more the dicta of prominent men in the several schools, or any dozen of isolated facts to which they appeal, it would show them to be fighting, not in array, but all in a *mêlée*, each man for his own hand, or not in combination against a common enemy, but in groups or singly to knock one another down. They are not one body, maintaining one notion of high human antiquity, but several bodies holding antagonistic theories about it; and so earnest are they in their reciprocal antagonisms, that often, in the heat of combat respecting the sheer theories, they forget the alleged facts altogether. To see them fighting, and how they fight, is abundantly enough for convincing a cool onlooker that their cause is bad. The alleged facts, too,

Digitized by Google

as we have seen, are all against them. Nor only so; but the alleged facts, unlike the theories, are coherent and consistent. All the alleged facts concur with one another, and with all the unchallenged facts of both science and Scripture, in pointing to a date of man's origin little different from the date given in the common chronology. The principal alleged facts, or those adduced by the geologists, also, are grandly harmonious with the Bible's general statement, that man was the latest-formed of God's creatures. Could the geologists have found some species of animal of later origin than man, they would then have done some damage to the Bible; but they find expressly, solely, abundantly, and everywhere that, exactly as the Bible states, the human being is the latest of all organic creatures.

The plea for high human antiquity does no more than attempt to push man farther back than the Bible does among species which existed before him; and, as we have seen, it utterly fails to do so. Nor does it simply fail, but it faints and vanishes. The pleading seems, to persons unacquainted with its language, to be dexterous and imposing, yet it is mere gesticulation or sawing of the air. The oratory of it sounds magniloquently, but is *vox et preterea nihil.* The geologists themselves, who are loudest in it, behave much as if they felt its nothingness. How toil-worn and gasping and struck down by one another are they in their arguing for the high antiquity of man, compared with their composure and confidence and unanimity, when propounding any of the great true facts of the geological system! Can they themselves imagine that they would ever have given the shadow of a shape to geology, or ever have drawn any persons into a belief in it, had they set forth its real

Digitized by Google

principles, such as the distinctions among rocks and the comparative oldness of strata, in any such empty manner as that in which they set forth the alleged high antiquity of man? What they call evidence here amounts to a mere speck in comparison with their mighty mountains of evidence for their true principles, and likewise is all of a kind which they themselves are obliged to term cumulative. They require to dig and scrape and sift for it in regions far distant from one another; and when they find any of it at all, they find it only in little isolated grains; and when they have brought all the grains together, they cannot build them into a coherent pile; and however they may present them to us, they cannot hinder them from appearing a quantity ludicrously small. Then the grains are not of the right sort; the alleged facts are either not facts at all or facts misunderstood; the evidence, while exceedingly trivial and entirely cumulative, is also all unreal. For as to any true evidence, the quantity of it which they get by exploring the earth's crust is much the same as they would get by ballooning round the world.

The plea for high human antiquity is likewise very misleading. It runs in lines which would lead to almost anything. Its methods of argument are methods which would defend almost any absurdity. Its reasonings from remote relations, from contiguities, from isolated features, from unessential things in the circumference apart from essential things in the centre, are all reasonings of a kind which might be framed in support of almost any falsehood. They are a sort of reasonings, for example, which would readily support the assertion that man is a brute. The alleged facts of the development of man out of monkey, of course, are all at hand;

Digitized by Google

and these would form a great circle of arguments by themselves, broadly endorsed by most of the very geologists who plead for high human antiquity. Then would come instances of savages about as dirty and stupid as gorillas; instances of deformed dwarfs, more unshapely than bears; instances of idiots and dotards, less sagacious than dogs and cats; instances of dumb persons, who can only yell or jabber; instances of cave-dwellers and clay-eaters, who feed as wildly as beasts of the forest; and various other instances of analogous kinds. And all these instances, along with the alleged ones for development, backed perhaps with some things which might be scraped out of the earth's crust, would form a very large and showy plea. Any special pleader who chooses to try his hand upon them can scarcely fail to make out as good a case from them for man's being a brute as the savants have made out from their materials for his having had a high antiquity.

The plea for high human antiquity, moreover, is self-explosive. It carries its own refutation within itself. It appeals mainly to things which directly prove it to be false. These things are human implements and human bones, as found in situations indicative of antiquity. But why are these so very few, so exceedingly sparse, so remarkably difficult to be obtained? Were human antiquity really high, they would be everywhere plentiful. Had men lived a hundred thousand years ago, men's bones would have been left in the drift gravel as surely as the mammoth's bones; and men having adaptation to all situations and climates, while the mammoth had adaptation to only some situations and climates, men's bones would have been left much more numerously anywhere than the mammoth, and left also

Digitized by Google

in zones or regions beyond the mammoth's range. Nor can we be told that human bones had any property which would hinder them from preservation, for we are told about certain isolated bits of human bone, and about two skulls, and about one entire skeleton, that these were preserved in what the savants reckon matrices of the mammoth times ; and we are entitled to say that, had human beings really existed a hundred thousand years ago, so as to have grown many myriads of millions of skeletons before the time of Adam, some fair proportion of these myriads of millions of skeletons, or of portions of them, would have been preserved as truly as the alleged very ancient skulls at Engis and Neanderthal, or as the allegedly very ancient skeleton at New Orleans. Abundance of very ancient human bones, and abundance of them everywhere, is the one main evidence to which the plea for high human antiquity points, and that evidence is totally awanting. This is the great leading witness whom the plea is to call into court ; and the witness, on being called, is found to be a fiction. The pleaders stand confounded ; they forgot about the calling of the leading witness ; they forgot even to inquire previously whether there should be a leading witness at all ; they relied bravely on their theory either to prove itself, or to make a leading witness if one should be wanted ; and now that the leading witness is not forthcoming, what shall they say ? Can they say anything ? Oh yes, on reflection, they say they have little doubt the witness has dropped into some unknown pit, and will one day appear. The very words of a chief of them, no other than Sir Charles Lyell, are, " That ere long, now that curiosity has been so much excited on this subject, some human remains will be detected in the

Digitized by Google

older alluvium of European valleys, I confidently expect." Hear that, ye listeners, and take out of it whatever conviction you can! No man ever searched "the older alluvium" more extensively than Sir Charles, and he never found "some human remains" in it; and had they been so plentiful as the plea implies, he surely must have found many of them in his later years. He "confidently expected," however, that "some" will be found. His confident expectation, after "curiosity had been so much excited on the subject," is offered to us in lieu of evidence. But why his confident expectation? Why? Because, as he goes on to say, the absence of human remains in the older alluvium "is a new and emphatic illustration of the extreme imperfection of the geological record." This from Sir Charles Lyell, the very leader of the uniformitarian school! If the geological record is anywhere, it is surely in the last page written. If that record is uniform throughout, it is surely uniform towards the end; if complete anywhere, is surely complete there. If light from the geological phenomena of the Adamic epoch is the light in which the entire geological record is to be read, this light is surely best, brightest, completest over the epoch immediately preceding the Adamic. Yet the record of that epoch, as regards anything about human remains, is all a blank. It attests distinctly and emphatically, by its silence, that man was not there. It proves clearly and irresistibly, from the data furnished by the geologists themselves, that man did not come into being before the Biblical Adamic time.

In conclusion, the plea for high human antiquity is right in the face of population statistics. No fact about men is more certain than the fact that they increase in

Digitized by Google

ascertainable geometrical progression. The rate of increase, in some exceptional instances, is exceedingly rapid—in other exceptional instances, is exceedingly slow; but, in every instance, is so nearly uniform as to be easily ascertainable—in many instances, through means of censuses, has been so exactly ascertained as to be a fixed quantity—and in all instances, taken collectively for computation through past time, can readily be struck for a fair average. Population in new countries, as instanced by the United States of America, without including immigrants, is doubled in 25 years; in steady old countries, as instanced by Scotland, is doubled in 46 years; and in agitated old countries, torn by war and revolutions, as instanced by Austria and France, is doubled in 187 or 200 years. Stuart Mill, in his "Political Economy," reckons it "a very low estimate of the capacity of increase, if we only assume that, in a good sanitary condition of the people, each generation may be double the number of the generation which preceded it." But, in order to give the utmost possible latitude to the plea for high human antiquity, let the doubling of population throughout the world be set down as occurring only at an interval of two hundred years. What will that datum give for the present population as flowing from all the past generations? Apply it to the commonly received chronology, from the time of Noah's leaving the ark, or 1657 years after the date popularly assigned to the creation of Adam, and it gives as the population of the world in A.D. 1853, no more than 16,777,216, or considerably less than what is known to have been the population of England and Wales alone. That datum of a doubling in every two hundred years, therefore, must be accepted by the advocates of

Digitized by Google

high human antiquity as not only moderate, but as demonstrably below the truth. Now let them apply it to their own theory. They all reject the fact of the Noahic deluge; they all count backward not only to the popular date of the creation of Adam, but very far beyond it; they all contend for a stream of population right onward from a date very long before the time of Adam; and they severally, or in several groups, place that date at from 12,000 to 100,000 years before Adam. What is the result? Commencing at only 12,000 years before the popular date of Adam, and starting with only a single pair of human beings, the datum of doubling in every two hundred years gives a population, at the beginning of the present century, of about 1,237,942,660,725,378,900,509,589,504, or more than a hundred thousand billions of times the actual number! Where or how, in the past conditions of the world, could such inconceivable multitudes of people have existed? Or where are the records or the relics of them? They could hardly have found standing-room in life, and must have left their bones as profusely as gravel-stones after death. Then, let the computation for them be started, not at 12,000 years before the Adamic date, but at 100,000 years before it, and it will so unutterably multiply them that they shall be heaped upon one another, over a great part of the world, both in life and in death, as closely and deeply as the piles of eggs in a provision store. A theory which brings out results like these, and offers no better proof of them than a dishful of cave-scrapings, is a more ineffable joke by far than was ever attempted by a histrionic clown. Nor is this all. A considerable proportion of the savants, not content with a high antiquity for one parental pair of human beings, contend

Digitized by Google

also for a plurality of parental pairs, and, in consequence, would correspondingly multiply the impossible increase of their posterity. Nay, one of the most distinguished of them, no doubt uttering the fancy of others as well as his own, says, "Men must have originated in nations as bees have originated in swarms." Yet all this wild farrago is loudly, pompously, and incessantly proclaimed as Science, science, science! and is flourished forth to impugn the Holy Book of God! As well may a fool's cap be flung at the sun to extinguish that stupendous luminary!

III. We now come to discuss the unity of the human race. Are mankind one species, or several species? Have they descended from one primal pair, or from several primal pairs? Are the distinctive divisions of them to be regarded as divergent varieties from one creation, or as separate currents from several creations? The Bible's answers are plain and plentiful. The Bible says the first woman was called Eve, "because she was the mother of all living;"[1] "God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth;"[2] and it currently, through all its tissue, exhibits men as all the descendants of Adam and Eve. Not the shadow of a doubt is permitted by it that mankind are one species. Nor is the unity of mankind set forth in it as a bare fact, as a matter of ethnology, or as a thing to be treated simply in a historical or a scientific way; but it is set forth for moral purposes, as a great doctrine linked with the highest teachings for both time and eternity. As the creation of man was the commencement of the entire Divine moral administration in our world, so the unity of mankind is concurrent with all

[1] Gen. iii. 20. [2] Acts xvii. 26.

Digitized by Google

that administration's design and progress. The fact that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men" is a fact published from the first, and published all along in order "that they should seek the Lord."[1] It lies at the very core of the truths of revelation. It is identified, either expressly or sequentially, with the pre-eminent doctrines of Adam's representative character, the introduction of sin, the moral condition of mankind, their relations to the Divine law, the giving and unfolding of the covenant of redemption, the incarnation of the Son of God, his substitutionary sacrifice, his representative character, his mediatorial reign, and the consummation of all things at the last day. How mightily doctrinal, how vitally important, then, is the fact of the unity of the human race!

A few Christians, nevertheless, as we observed in our previous section, are so blind as not to see its importance. But they are blinded solely by dusty misapprehensions of geology; and, could they be freed from these, they would have altogether different views. Some ethnologists also do not see its importance. But they do not look at its moral bearings; they regard it as exclusively a matter of ethnology; and, being intent only on the classifying of the distinctive divisions of mankind, they care not whether these be classed as varieties or as species. Other ethnologists and some geologists, however, see its importance well. They may not understand all its connections with Christian doctrines, but they comprehend fully its relation to the truthfulness of Scripture; and they controvert the fact of the unity of mankind in the same sort of spirit in which they or others controvert the facts of man's special creation and

[1] Acts xvii. 27.

Digitized by Google

his comparatively recent origin. These are the men whom we have to combat here. But our round of fight with them does not need to be either tough or long. Their arguments, as compared with the arguments for development and for high antiquity, are neither numerous nor intricate. Their arguments, indeed, are not properly arguments at all, but mainly or altogether travesties. Let the proofs be stated for the unity of mankind; let them be stated in the Bible's own manner, with the Bible's own explanations; and these very proofs, under such masks and disguises as conceal or misrepresent their true aspects, are the very arguments of the opponents. All we have to do, therefore, is to state the proofs, and to tear the disguises away.

First, then, the unity of mankind is proved by their intellectuality. This distinguishes them from the brutes, and is the same in them all. It includes both reason and conscience; is both mathematical and moral; works consocially among men themselves, and religiously towards God; aspires to improvement in the present world, and to immortality or immortal bliss in the world to come; undergoes education, with capacity for indefinite increase of knowledge and well-being; and impels or moves on, or is capable of moving on, to continual progress in thought, invention, and achievement both in individuals and in communities. And it differs in all these characters from instinct or sagacity in the brutes, and possesses all these characters in each and all of the distinctive divisions of mankind. But it has not a uniform measure of them in all individuals. It exhibits diversity everywhere in its own strength or degree; diversity everywhere in even the balance of its faculties. As stars differ from one another in brilliance, so will the

Digitized by Google

minds or souls of even the very best of men, at even the last day, differ from one another in grandeur.[1] All grades of intellect, from that of the infant or the idiot, "who sinned not after the similitude of Adam's transgression," to the rapt seer, who soared and sang like a seraph, figure in the teachings of Scripture exactly as they figure in the present ethnology of the world.

Now both the differentiæ of intellect and the grades of intellect are handled as arguments against the unity of mankind; but they are handled only and violently in the way of caricature or travesty. Evolutionists try to mineralize the differentiæ into modified atoms—to grind the entire intellect into protoplasm—to work reason and instinct and life and matter all into one and the same thing; but, as was shown in our first section, they have no manner of success, no more than if they tried to hide a sunset-glory in a blanket; do what they may, or argue as they will, they never prevent the soul, at any one stage of their movements, from continually shedding forth its differential luminosity and radiance. Other ethnologists expatiate on grades of intellect as allegedly characteristic of the distinctive sections of mankind. They point to the intellects of Europeans, Chinese, Esquimaux, American Indians, Polynesians, Negroes, and Hottentots as intellects of allegedly different grades or kinds. They set forth the intellects of some divisions of mankind as quick, and of others as slow; of some as imaginative or mercurial, and of others as pragmatic or plodding; of some as apt for civilization or for monotheism, and of others as persistent in barbarism or in idolatry; and they thence leap to the con-

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 41, 42.

Digitized by Google

clusion that the several divisions of mankind, as possessing the several grades or kinds of intellect, are distinct species, severally descended from different parent stocks. But, first, some sections of mankind have lived for generations in educational circumstances utterly adverse to intellectual well-being as compared with the educational circumstances of others; and therefore may be expected to differ from these in activity and feats of intellect, as much as the sons of a moorland peasant differ from the sons of a city magnate. Next, some sections of mankind have lived always in conditions of climate, food, and occupation utterly adverse to intellectual growth as compared with those of others; and therefore may be expected to differ from these in constitutional strength of intellect, more than the beggars of an intertropical city differ from the gentlemen of a European capital. Again, any one section of mankind has all gradations of intellect, from very low to very high; includes individual children, from an idiot to a genius, who may compare with individual children of any other section; and exhibits among its people alike a capacity to acquire intellectual eminence and a tendency to sink into intellectual debasement. Farther, the sub-sections or groups of any one division of mankind, even sub-sections or groups of either of two extreme divisions into which any ethnologist has classified the whole race, differ from one another in mental and moral characteristics quite as much as the entire division differs from any neighbouring division, or as the two extreme divisions differ from each other. Lastly, the diversities of mental and moral character throughout the world now, in so far as truly depicted by ethnologists, are not broader or more distinctive than the diversities of mental

Digitized by Google

and moral character throughout the world anciently, as depicted by the Bible. Thus the argument from intellectuality for mankind being several species is nothing else than a travesty of the proof that they are one species.

Second, the unity of mankind is proved by their faculty of speech. Both this faculty and the lingual organization for it are possessed by all nations and classes of men, but are not possessed by any brutes; and therefore they distinguish man, in a differential way, from every other animal. They also were used originally in the utterance of only one language, and have been used since or are used now in the utterance of languages all derived from the original one language; and therefore, not only in themselves, but likewise in the exercise of them, they prove mankind to be one species. Adam used language even before Eve was created,[1] and "the whole earth," after the flood, "was of one language and one speech."[2] But the one language was speedily transmuted into many. The dispersions of at once Japhethites, Hamites, and Shemites, to the multitudes of different settlements, far distant from one another, throughout the ancient world, were dispersions, not "only after their families, in their nations," but "every one after his tongue," or severally "after their tongues."[3] These things—man's original endowment with speech, the prevalence for a time of only one language, and the early transmutation of that one into many—are conjoint facts, and must be understood conjointly in the proof they give that mankind are one species. That proof, when fairly considered, is overwhelmingly strong; and it derives corroboration from

[1] Gen. ii. 18-23. [2] Ibid. xi. 1. [3] Ibid. x. 5, 20, 31.

Digitized by Google

several facts which were named in our previous section, and which need not be repeated.

Yet both the faculty of speech and the multiplicity of languages are perverted into arguments against the unity of mankind. The argument from speech turns mainly on the circumstance that speech is impossible to infants, and needs to be acquired. But it thus takes adult men to be what infants are; and therefore would prove that man cannot sing, cannot wash, cannot walk, cannot dress. It also, by parity of principle, would take a perfect insect to be what a larva is, or a bird to be what an egg is; and therefore would prove that neither a butterfly nor an eagle can fly. The argument from multiplicity of languages points to their differences of construction, to their wide diversities from one another, to the fewness of words or of roots which they have in common, to the multitudinousness of words in each, and to the apparent classifiableness of all into several distinct families; and infers that they indicate a number of separate sources or origins. This argument is best met by the testimony of eminent linguists. "Our historical researches respecting languages," says Bunsen, "have led us to facts which seem to oblige us to assume the common historical origin into which we found the nations of Asia and Europe to coalesce." "The comparative study of languages," says Humboldt, "shows us that races now separated by vast tracts of land are allied together, and have migrated from one common primitive seat." "Looking back to all the most ancient languages," says Dr. Hincks, "I find that, although there were marked differences which rendered them utterly unintelligible to one another, there were points in common which, when fairly examined, proved that those lan-

Digitized by Google

guages had all a common origin." "If we observe," says Max Müller, "how Latin was changed into Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, French, &c.—how Latin again, together with Greek and the Celtic, the Teutonic, and the Slavonic languages, together likewise with the ancient dialects of India and Persia, must have sprung from an earlier language, the mother of the whole Indo-European or Aryan family of speech; if we see how Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac, with several minor dialects, are but different impressions of one and the same common type, and must all have flowed from the same source, the original language of the Semitic race; and if we add to these two at least one more well-established family of speech, the Turanian, comprising the dialects of the nomad races scattered over central and northern Asia; and if we watch this stream of language rolling on through centuries in these three mighty arms, which, before they disappear from our sight in the far distance, clearly show a convergence towards one common source —it would seem, indeed, as if there were an historical life inherent in language, and as if both the will of man and the power of time could tell, if not on its substance, at least on its form." We might quote much more testimony, but we have quoted enough; and we shall conclude here in the words of Latham, the well-known ethnological writer and vice-president of the Ethnological Society, "We may be satisfied with the doctrines laid down—that, as a matter of fact, the languages of the earth's surface are referable to one common origin—and that, as a matter of logic, this common origin of language is *primâ facie* evidence of a common origin for those who speak it."

Third, the unity of mankind is proved by conjointly

Digitized by Google

their original equipment for every purpose of art and science, their early dispersion through all parts of the ancient world, and their physical and mental adaptation to all diversities of climate and country. Their original equipment for every purpose of art and science, or original possession of every essential thing in what we now call civilization, is depicted in the Bible's account of Adam, Cain, Jabal, Jubal, Tubalcain, Noah, and the builders of the pristine postdiluvian cities; and will be formally discussed in our next section. That equipment, exactly like the faculty of speech, was innate in the first man, was a unique thing for himself and his posterity, descended from him to them and along them in a continuous stream, and was a common fitting of them for a proper inhabiting of the world; and therefore, like their intellectuality and their faculty of speech, though like these it underwent alteration with the effluxion of time and with their many migrations, it stamped them all as distinctly and stringently one species. The converse of it, indeed, is pleaded by many savants, and worked into such false views of civilization as impugn the unity of mankind; but that results entirely from a false handling of facts, and will be exposed in our next section. The early dispersion of mankind is narrated in Gen. x. 1–32 and xi. 9; is there shown to have scattered them into all the countries which became included in the subsequent great empires; is corroborated, as we have seen, by the history of languages; and is corroborated also by the passage of Herodotus narrating the removal of the Phœnicians from the Indian Ocean to the Levant, and by other passages in ancient secular historians. That dispersion, therefore, shows all mankind to have radiated from one centre, or to have

Digitized by Google

flowed away, in their several distinctive lines, from a common source. The dispersion, too, as narrated in the Bible, took place in three great bodies, each comprising many separate communities ; it was a dispersion of respectively Japhethites, Hamites, and Shemites, "after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, after their nations ; " and, in that view, it is confirmed by the classifications of mankind at the present day in systems of ethnology. These classifications, it is true, do not exactly coincide with the distribution into Japhethites, Hamites, and Shemites ; but they are founded on very manifold, intricate, and elaborate deductions, all drawn backward from the existing state of mankind, and many of them from very defective information or even from mere conjecture, so that they are certain to contain a mixture of error ; yet they notably and persistently exhibit mankind as consisting of three great sections, Caucasian, Mongolian, and Ethiopian ; and they arrive at the threefold division on concurrent grounds, essentially the same as those designated "families, tongues, lands, and nations." The distinctiveness of mankind into three great classes, with possible further distinctiveness into sub-classes, is, nevertheless, pleaded as an argument against the unity of mankind ; yet that very distinctiveness is here seen to be a direct proof of the unity.

The original equipment of men for every purpose of art and science worked concurrently with their early dispersion ; produced results of one kind or of similar kinds everywhere ; and, as seen in these results, gives retrospective proof that they are one species. Husbandry was practised alike by Adam's sons, by Jubal, and by Noah ; city-building was practised alike by Cain and by

Digitized by Google

Nimrod; metallurgy was practised alike by Tubalcain and by the early postdiluvian warriors; many arts of life, and much knowledge of a scientific character, were necessarily practised by as many communities of the early dispersion as migrated to great distances; and all these and other essential details of civilization were likely to be well known to those who removed into remote regions. The existence of ancient monuments, therefore, comes to be another proof that the human race is one species. The ancient monuments of Egypt, of Babylonia, of Assyria, of India, and of other lands, whether monuments still extant or monuments only on record, are exactly what the doctrine of the unity of mankind, as seen in the light of the Bible, leads us to expect. In no other way than on the ground of the unity of mankind, as proved by their original equipment for every purpose of art and science and by their early dispersion, can the existence of these monuments be accounted for. Savants, indeed, as we formerly saw, attempt to evolve the monuments out of an alleged high antiquity of man; but in doing so, as we also abundantly have seen, they simply attempt to evolve something out of nothing. The alleged high antiquity of man is nowhere; yet the monuments are here. The alleged original barbarism of man, whence the savants attempt to argue the alleged high antiquity of man, also is nowhere; yet the monuments are here. The savants' argument, therefore, is tantamount to saying that one nothing built upon another nothing makes a great monument, or rather that one nothing built upon another nothing made every one of the ancient monuments, pyramids and all. Then, as to the pyramids and other great works standing so far back in time, so very much nearer the flood era than the Christian era, what

Digitized by Google

about that? Civilization, as we shall show in our next section, deteriorated rapidly; it deteriorated in art and science, just as it deteriorated in morals and religion; it was much stronger and brighter as it came out of Noah's ark than it afterwards became; and it was exactly in the condition in the Noahic age or in the following one to perform then its greatest exploits. Hence do the very pyramids themselves point to the unity of the human race. And as to the ancient monuments being situated in lands at considerable distances from the supposed position of Noah's ark, what again about that? The very record of the dispersion points to all these very lands as settlements of the early emigrants. And the record of our own times, or the very memory of living men, points to the analogous cases of great towns in classic architecture being built by emigrants from Britain, within a few years, on what were previously waste tracts in America and in Australia.

The physical and mental adaptation of mankind to all diversities of climate and territory was essential both to their dispersion over all the world and to the exercise everywhere of their knowledge or faculty of civilization; and it proves, as these do, both by itself and conjointly with them, that mankind are one species. It is a distinct characteristic, a manifest differentia, an undoubted peculiarity of men—quite as clearly so as intellectuality or the faculty of speech; and it is possessed by all men alike and by no animals but men, and therefore proves them to be a unity, both as viewed in themselves and as distinguished from any brute. Argument against their unity is sometimes attempted from analogy of the lower animals; but every such argument, no matter how strongly built, is a castle in the air—a structure without

Digitized by Google

a base. No analogy is possible. No species of lower animal spreads over all lands, spreads continuously, spreads alike in arctic and in torrid climates, alike over lofty plateaus and deeply depressed plains. Men alone have universal terrene adaptation ; and they have it not only in great groups who reside where they were born, but in every individual who chooses to travel. Any one healthy man may spend one part of his life at the frozen sea and another between the tropics, one part in an alpine region and another at sea-level.

The three characteristics, original civilization, early dispersion, and universal adaptation, also point, severally and collectively, to one common place of origin. They show that all men *may* have radiated from one primal centre ; they thence, by the rule of admitting no more cause for an effect than is sufficient to produce it, show that all *must* have radiated from only one centre ; and they then, through that medium also, prove again that all are one species. Every species of animal had a centre of creation ; any species narrowly distributed had a centre with short radius ; any species widely distributed had a centre with long radius ; and any plurality of species included in one genus had a corresponding plurality of centres. Men, therefore, could be shown to be several species only by their being shown to have had several centres of creation. But most systems of ethnology, though treating them retrospectively and losing or rejecting the light thrown upon them by the Bible are compelled to assign them only one centre. The very developmentists are obliged to derive them all from the region of the anthropoid apes ; the linguistic ethnologists are driven to derive them all from some region of south-eastern Asia ; and the comprehensive ethno-

Digitized by Google

logists, who try to build their system logically or with due regard to all kinds of ethnological considerations, derive them all from some one spot, they cannot exactly say where, about the centre of the ancient civilized world. Now, from men reasoning retrospectively, most of them under influence of adverse theory, and all without influence or guidance from the Bible, what nearer approximation to the Bible's own account could we expect? The developmentists are carried too far south, simply by the force of their wild theory about the evolvement of men out of apes; and the linguistic ethnologists are carried too far east, simply by the force of their fanciful theory that the original language of men was monosyllablic; but the comprehensive ethnologists, being quite or comparatively free from the force of theory, are carried as closely as can be to the very spot, somewhere in the basin of the Euphrates, which the Bible indicates as the cradle of all mankind.

Fourth, the unity of mankind is proved by the very physical varieties which mainly distinguish them into groups or classes. All these are of kinds which lie within the limits of species. All are similar to the varieties in many a species of either plant or lower animal, which has an exceedingly narrower range of both flexibility and distribution than man. All either exhibit the tendencies towards primal type which are exhibited by varieties of other species, or possess no greater comparative fixity than is possessed by some of these. All shade into one another, through all mankind, from group to group, everywhere and everyhow, in such nice gradations, such imperceptible transitions, such interfusing assimilations, as prove them to have a common root. All are due to causes or to influences, not only acting

Digitized by Google

within the limits of species, and not only competent to produce them within these limits, and not only perceptible as to both what they are and how they operate, but likewise much more distinct in themselves, and much more open to investigation than the causes or influences which produce varieties in a species of plant or in a species of lower animal. Some very notable varieties also, and these of very early date, as of the curse upon Canaan, the skin of the Ethiopian, and the gigantic size of the Anakim, are stamped on the Bible's own picture of "the one blood" of mankind; and these notable varieties, both from their prominence and from their earliness, exhibit causes or involve principles which imply all others. Hence are the very physical varieties of mankind a proof that mankind are one species.

Yet these physical varieties form the strongest and longest arguments of adverse ethnologists against the unity of mankind. Nay, they are worked into numerous arguments, and discussed at a length to constitute many volumes. They are the very staple of not a few works on ethnology, both against the unity of mankind and for it. The skull, the face, the eyes, the nose, the mouth, the profile, the hair, the skin, the stature, and some other constituents of conformation or complexion, are all treated as so many different materials for different arguments. But, in the handling of these against the unity of mankind, four essential considerations are always more or less overlooked or suppressed. One of these is the connexion of the skull, or of the variational form of the skull, with the other features of head and face; another is the operation of such influences as emigration, climate, food, and occupation; a third is the persistency or long continuousness of any

Digitized by Google

peculiar external conditions of any groups of men; and the fourth is the occurrence of variation structure or variation features in individuals, as distinguished from groups. The advocates of a plurality of species in men labour at once to make variation characters as numerous and as mutually independent as possible, to represent them as innate or radical or irrespective of outside influences, to exhibit the most persistent ones as the rule of origin or measure of duration for all the rest, and to identify all, or so many as they can, and as much as they can, with great territorial groups of men. Their reasonings, in consequence, are thoroughly fallacious. What they do is partly to shuffle facts out of their real connexions, partly to push operating influences into remote position or total concealment, and altogether to transmute a great plain truth of the unity of mankind into an elaborate argument against the unity. But let us go into some details.

The skull is the most important part of structure. Both the size and the shape of it are endlessly discussed. All the several bones of it, the frontal bone, the occipital bone, the parietal bone, the zygomata, the malar bones, the nasal bones, the maxillary bones, are treated as several constituents of diversity. But the adverse ethnologists put all the sizes, shapes, and parts together, in a wonderful series of comparisons of skull with skull; and let them, therefore, tell us how many different sorts of skulls there are. Will they say so many as a hundred or several hundred species of men? No; they do not. They plead for no more than three or at most seven species. What then comes of their argument from skulls? Oh, say they, certain averages of skull conformation prevail among one group of men, certain

Digitized by Google

other averages prevail in another group, certain averages prevail in a third group; and, there being no more averages for making a fourth group, these three averages prove the species of men to be three. Powerful proof! mighty as a hurricane! enough to tear up the strongest logic, root and branch! If two hundred seedlings grow from a sowing of pansies, and no two individuals of them are perfectly alike, while many a two are exceedingly unlike, can any averages of their forms or hues or of the distributions of their forms and hues determine the two hundred to be three or seven species? Either all are separate species or all are one species. And so also are men, with their hundreds of different sorts of skulls. Either they are hundreds of different species, or they are all one species. No averages of characteristics throughout a multitude of individuals, but identical or closely similar characteristics in each of any number of individuals separately, are taken to determine species in every department of both botany and zoology; and if the latter be sought in the size and shape and conformation of human skulls, they will make mankind to be hundreds of species. How many diversities of human skulls are there in England? Men's skulls here range in capacity from 55 to 114 cubic inches, and in diversities of conformation from the low receding idiotic to the lofty vertical intellectual; and if classified by differences of an inch in capacity, and by something of corresponding importance in conformation, they might be represented as proving that Englishmen alone comprise upwards of a hundred species. Some of them, too, would show some of the species to be marvellously small. Any one, for example, which should be so singularly unique as the geologists describe the fossil skull of

Digitized by Google

Neanderthal to be, would make the one individual who possessed it to be a species in himself. Then what shall be said about diversities throughout the world, about diversities in very small communities, and about resemblances at points of territory half the world asunder? Diversities are everywhere, and resemblances occur among widely distant groups. Who has not known instances of two men, with skulls of exceedingly different size and shape, born of one mother? Or who has not heard of instances of a philosopher's son in England, with as miserable a skull as the skull of any Hottentot? Or who has not seen, as he walked along any crowded street in Europe, as many diversities of skulls as might have been duplicates of all on which the ethnologists have built their systems? Certain diversities, no doubt, prevail in one group of mankind, and certain other diversities in another group; and these serve, justly enough, the purposes of distinctive description or of ethnography; but they have no bearing whatever, no more than the number of a man's inches or the weight of his body, upon a question of plurality of species. The prevalence of some diversities rather than of others in any group is due entirely to causes which go no farther than to a question of variety. Yet this matter of diversities of skulls is the most prominent of all the matters urged against the unity of mankind. It is a matter obvious enough in itself, but a matter rendered utterly ridiculous by contact with the notion of a plurality of human species; and but for the adverse ethnologists being well known as scholarly men with excellent heads, it might make that notion appear to have all issued either from a cracked skull or from a very thick one.

The diversities of face, nose, mouth, and profile are

Digitized by Google

mere phases of diversities of skulls, and need not be separately noticed. Diversities of stature or of thorax or of pelvis, taken as characters of species, are simply ludicrous. Diversities of eye, as to either shape, size, direction, or colour, are scarcely any better. Diversities of hair, as to coarseness or fineness, lankiness or curliness, sparseness or profuseness, or as to any shade of colour, are nothing better; yet, as to woolliness in black populations distinctively from tressiness in white ones, form a character of persistency due to continuance of peculiar external conditions of one group of population distinctively from another. Diversities of complexion or of the colour of the skin, alone have any apparent importance; and these belong to the same category as woolliness or tressiness of the hair. They owe their origin to peculiarities of climate, peculiarities of personal exposure, and peculiarities of food and occupation and social customs; and owe their persistency to continuance of the same external conditions. A fair-complexioned European, by a few years' exposure to a vertical sun, becomes permanently tawny over as much of his body as is exposed to the sun's action; and, if he lived as the intertropical natives do, would become permanently tawny all over his body. The Jews of Malabar, though modernly descended from a fair-complexioned stock, are as black as negroes. The populations of some parts of Oceanica, seemingly from longer or shorter lines of descent since the time of ancestral settlement, comprise different groups, ranging from sallow or brown to black. Negroes, too, might possibly be whitened by colonization near the Arctic ocean. The negro skin, at all events, passes into mulatto, into quadroon, into octroon, the last as averagely fair as the average skin of Europeans, simply

Digitized by Google

by cross-breeding; and it thereby proves the negro to be as strictly one species with the white man as any transmutation of properties in the farm-stock of horses or bovine cattle or sheep proves the different breeds of horses to be all one species, or the different breeds of bovine cattle to be all one species, or the different breeds of sheep to be all one species.

Nor does either persistency of any peculiarity throughout a line of descent, or the prevalence of it throughout a territorial group, at all affect the question. Any cause which originates a peculiarity is competent also to prolong it. Black skin or woolly hair, and even short stature and receding skull, when once arising under peculiar conditions of climate, costume, customs, food, and occupation, are not likely to vanish under the same conditions, or will revert somewhat toward the original type only in rare individuals or under modification of the conditions. The silk-weavers of Spitalfields and the farm-labourers of the south of Scotland, as has been shown by an elaborate statistical publication of 1870, form two groups of men distinguished by the important physical properties of stature, weight, and muscular power, and of course also by correlative properties; they differ from each other by these, in characters or contrasts of variation, as much as any great groups of mankind differ in other aggregates of physical properties; they have the differentiæ both pervadingly and persistently, or both among one generation throughout and from generation to generation; and they owe the differentiæ entirely to such outside influences as occupation and food. And similar is it with the distinctive peculiarities of any two or more groups of men, small or great, throughout the world. The peculiarities, too, are not

Digitized by Google

greater than those which characterize different varieties of one species of lower animal. The rock-pigeon and the fantail, the wild rabbit and the domiciled rabbit, the bulldog and the greyhound, the Syrian sheep and the Southdown, the Alderney cow and the Shorthorn, the Shetland pony and the London dray-horse, are severally as different from each other as are any two groups of human beings. Nor is either pervadingness or persistency ever strong enough to maintain uniformity, or even to prevent sudden return in an individual to the remote ancestral type. Natives with fair countenance and bright red hair are found among the blackish-skinned and very frizzy black-haired population of New Guinea; and albinos, or natives of white colour or very fair complexion, are not uncommon in the intertropical parts of Africa. Then what shall be said about sudden transitions and wide variations in a single family anywhere—such as a dwarf from tall parents, a small man and a large one from the same parents, a deformed son from a symmetrical father, a receding skull with scarcely a forehead from a father with vertical skull and broad high forehead, three or more children with marked differences of eyes and hair and face and profile all from the same parents? Or what shall be said about such a case as that of Esau and Jacob, a hairy man and a smooth man, the sons of one mother and born in one birth? Or what again shall be said about the interfusions of feature and complexion and structural diversity from group to group all round the world—interfusions everywhere and everyhow, in all zones and at all altitudes, onward or zigzag or across, and all so nicely gradational that no ethnologist can say how numerous they are, or tell exactly where one group ends and another begins? All these facts, all the con-

Digitized by Google

siderations we have pointed at, all correct illustrations or estimates of the physical diversities of men, as to either their kinds, their causes, or their conditions, go directly, concurrently, overwhelmingly to the conclusion that mankind are one species.

Fifth, the unity of mankind is proved by the radical oneness of their moral varieties. These are either ethical or devotional. The ethical have reference to the relations between man and man; and the devotional have reference to matters of religion. All spring out of conscience; and, in so far as all are more or less defective or depraved, they all owe their defects or depravities to defect or depravity in the conscience. All have one root, and therefore have one character, and therefore prove mankind to be one species. Conscience projects them all, circulates through them all, is the life-blood of all; so that, throughout their innumerable shades of difference and even in their characters of contrast, it makes them radically one. And conscience is the moral working of intellect; it is a working of the intellect stronger or more distinctive than the mere rational working; it is the greater one of the two sides of that intellectuality which was our first proof of the unity of mankind; and therefore, through the medium of the moral diversities of human beings, it strongly proves them to be one species. All men lost rectitude in the fall of Adam; all have the germ of sin and the virus of death by descent from Adam; for "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that (in him) all have sinned."[1] All men also, excepting infants and born idiots, who have not lived into personal exercise of conscience or "have not sinned after the

[1] Rom. v. 12.

Digitized by Google

similitude of Adam's transgression," are personally sinners against God, by violation of His one moral law, in imbuement with one transgressional animus, and under amenability to one final judgment. For "what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." [1] And God, who "hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead." [2]

Atheism alone will try to resist this proof of the unity of mankind. Even deism will scarcely attempt to impugn it. No sort of adverse system can possibly withstand it. Yet antagonistic ethnologists behave very strangely towards it. They are silent respecting the ethical diversities among men, but have much to say respecting the religious diversities. They see clearly that intemperance, impurity, deceit, falsehood, fraud, chicanery, envy, jealousy, hatred, calumny, malice, wrath, truculency, of all kinds and quantities, abound throughout the world, and more or less deform and blacken every considerable section of mankind. They can find no great diversities in these; none great enough to be made a pretext for difference of species; scarcely any so great as to be distinct marks of even diversities of variety. They, therefore, say nothing respecting ethical diversities. They let these go by the run, as common to all large groups of men. But they say much respecting religious diversities. They make these to be alleged

[1] Rom. iii. 19. [2] Acts xvii. 26, 31.

Digitized by Google

proofs of plurality of species, nearly or quite as much as diversities of intelligence, of language, of structure, and of feature; and they do so, and can do so, only in ways to defy logic and to stultify themselves. First, they divorce religion from ethics; and they might just as logically or as harmlessly divorce one-half of the brain from the other half, or one-half of the heart from the other half, or sentiments from emotions, or words from speech. Next, they do not and cannot obtain any show of coincidence between the alleged religious indications of plurality and the alleged mental, lingual, or structural indications, but are compelled to exhibit the two sets of indications as overlapping, overleaping, crossing, and intercrossing one another with such boldness and frequency as to produce utter confusion, and to make the drawing of any inference from them impossible. Next, as a result of persisting to apply both sets of indications, they bring out widely different conclusions from the two —more alleged species from the one than from the other; and they thus make their system self-contradictory, or reduce it to absurdity. Nor do they act thus overtly or formally, so as to bring the confusion, the self-contradiction, the absurdity into open view; but they outline their classification mainly on the ground of one set, or chiefly on the ground of structure and feature, and fill in details of it from the other set, or diversities in religion; and they, in consequence, prove their system to be wrong in the very germ, wrong in the very essence, wrong so utterly that the alleged data for it cannot be placed side by side at the foundation. And next they ignore the fact—a few of them even controvert the fact—that all the diversities of false religion are simply corruptions or perversions of the one true religion. This fact runs

Digitized by Google

alongside of the fact that all the diversities in social condition are either descents, transmutations, or decadences of the pristine civilization ; and will be incidentally illustrated in our treatment of that subject in our next section. The fact is abundantly apparent in all archæology ; in ancient monuments, both extant and recorded ; in the early fragments of the history of ancient nations ; in the symbols or symbolic teachings of the ancient mythologists ; in the diffusions or transmutations of mythologies from country to country, and from age to age ; in the re-assertion of monotheism, again and again and often, by reflecting members of polytheistic communities ; in ancient traditions of revelation, of miracles, of a golden age, and of the flood ; in the unanimous expectation of the civilized world, for ages before the Christian era, that the advent of a Divine moral deliverer of mankind was at hand ; and in the rites of sacrifice, through all ages and in all lands, accompanied with notions of guilt, of propitiation, and of Divine moral government. So patent is the fact in one and all of these lights, that multitudes of scholarly men have recognized it, and argued it simply as a matter of archæology. Religious diversities, therefore, quite as much as ethical diversities, or rather as identical with ethical diversities, have a radical oneness, and are a proof, through that radical oneness, that mankind are one species.

Sixth and last, the unity of mankind is proved by their common capacity for the common salvation. One consciousness of guilt, sooner or later, weaker or stronger, is in all men ; one anticipation of future judgment, sooner or later, weaker or stronger, is in all ; one craving for Divine mercy, through some propitiation, of one kind or another, is in all ; one capacity for quietude of

Digitized by Google

conscience, peace of mind, and hope of future bliss, through a view of Divine mercy, is in all; one unfitness to obtain a distinct or certain or satisfying view of Divine mercy, otherwise than as manifested in the mediatorship of the Lord Jesus Christ, is in all; and a fitness to receive and enjoy perfect quietude, peace, and hope, through a view of the Divine mercy as manifested in the mission and work of Christ, is alike in all. And here is a differentia, here is a mark of oneness of species, as clear as noonday, and unspeakably grander than any other differentia in the world. It is a mark, too, impressed with a seal containing its counterpart. The capacity for salvation by Christ corresponds exactly to the salvation itself. Mankind have one disease, and there is one physician for them; they are in one captivity, and there is one redeemer for them; they are under one condemnation, and there is one expiator for them; they have one defilement, and there is one purifier for them; they all bear one broken, shattered, defaced image of God, and there is one Divine restorer who, alike in any, can make all things new, and create the image again in all its pristine perfection and glory. "Christ Jesus gave Himself a ransom for all." [1] "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world." [2] "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." [3]

The one salvation is suited to all men; and it is suited to each as to all, and to all as to each. It has not only one author, one administrator, one result, but also one aim, one character, one influence, one method. It is not one thing diverging in several directions toward different

[1] 1 Tim. ii. 6. [2] 1 John ii. 2. [3] Acts iv. 12.

Digitized by Google

peoples, but one thing coming in one direction towards one people. It is suited by one force, in one way, through one means, alike to the semi-idiot and the savant, to the babbling savage and the many-tongued scholar, to the puny dwarf and the athletic giant, to the black man and the white, to the beggar and the prince, to the captive and the conqueror, to the little child and the hoary patriarch, to the bland man of many charities and the bloody man of many crimes. "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in you all." [1] The Divine scheme for saving men is one like the terrestrial globe, which gives them all habitation on its ample surface; one like the celestial vault, which enspheres them all within its boundless canopy; one like the rainbow over the throne of God, which includes them all beneath its limitless arch. Not that the salvation takes effect upon all, but that it has adaptation, appropriateness, freeness, and fulness for all; and not that it comes home to any except those who receive it, or "who believe and are saved," but that it reaches the receivers of it by one adaptation and in one way. All mankind, as offered it, are one in Adam; and all believers, as receiving it, are one in Christ. Men of all climes, all countries, all ages, all diversities, whether mental, linguistic, physical, social, or moral, have one capacity for it; and all saved men, wheresoever they were found by it or whatsoever were their characters, have one experience in it; for "by one Spirit are they all baptized into one body, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, whether they be bond or free, and have been

[1] Eph. iv. 4-6.

Digitized by Google

all made to drink into one Spirit." [1] "Many shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God." [2] "They have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man, who is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him, where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond, nor free; but Christ is all, and in all." [3] "They are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for they are all one in Christ Jesus." [4]

There is evidence for the unity of mankind higher far than any evidence which a philosopher asks for anything he believes. It is evidence twofold—first, in the oneness of capacity which all men have for the one salvation, and next, in the oneness of result in all, mentally and morally, which the one salvation brings. An infidel ethnologist may refuse to accept it, just as he refuses to accept the stupendous evidences that the Bible is the book of God; yet, if he can be induced to reflect a little, he may see it clearly, and see it everywhere, among the very facts which he examines for the constructing of his ethnological system. Nothing among these facts is more striking than the reciprocity between men's capacity for well-being and the influence of Christianity. When an ethnologist describes two territorial circles round two territorial groups of mankind, and says the one group is Christian and the other non-Christian, he commits a great mistake. The real facts are that, throughout much

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 13. [2] Matt. viii. 11; Luke xiii. 29.
[3] Col. iii. 9–11. [4] Gal. iii. 26, 28.

Digitized by Google

of the so-called Christian group, Christianity is practically unknown ; that, throughout the rest of that group, it is practically known in very various degrees ; and that, throughout the so-called non-Christian group, here and there, to a considerable aggregate extent, it is practically known as distinctly and strongly as in much of the really Christian portion of the so-called Christian group. These are the facts ; and they have a clearness, a force, a manifest observableness far more than most of the facts which are used by the infidel ethnologist for forming his classifications. And if he simply look at them as he looks at his other facts, he will be constrained to accept the mutual contact of the human mind and Christian truth, both as the largest phenomenon in ethnology and as sure evidence that mankind are one species. Christianity, not in men's profession of it but in their belief of it, not in symbols of it on the outward position but in workings of it on the heart, not in sham but in reality, not as a form but as a power, or Christianity genuinely, is by far the mightiest force which operates on mankind ; produces effects grander and more signal than those which are produced by any or all other forces ; and it works alike, and produces its effects alike, on men of every calibre, colour, class, clime, and country. No specific difference, not even any variational difference, no difference of any kind whatever, is apparent anywhere, between any one class of men and any other class of men, in the contact of mankind's mighty capacity for well-being with the mighty force of Christianity to create that well-being. Everything, under the strong light of this greatest of ethnological facts, proclaims that mankind are one species.

A Christian ethnologist sees the evidence at once.

Digitized by Google

Nor does he see it merely in the breadth which we have indicated; but he sees it in a greater breadth still, and in a far higher glory. The real amount of evidence is vastly greater than we have yet put it. John indicated the length and height of it when he said, "I beheld, and lo a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues, stood before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands." [1] That great multitude themselves indicate the length and height of it, as they ever sing in adoration of the Lamb, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests." [2] But the Lamb Himself, the Divine Saviour, is revealed to view, as in His own person the centre and glory of it all. For "when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that they might receive the adoption of sons." [3] And "both He that maketh atonement and they for whom atonement is made are all of one, for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren; and forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same." [4] Humanity as a race is represented and glorified in the personal humanity of the Son of God. "The first man was of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven; and as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." [5] The body of every Christian man, whether dwarf or giant, hideous or hand-

[1] Rev. vii. 9. [2] Ibid. v. 9, 10. [3] Gal. iv. 4, 5.
[4] Heb. ii. 11–14. [5] 1 Cor. xv. 47, 49.

Digitized by Google

some, black or white, with a low skull or with a high one, will be fashioned by Christ "like unto His glorious body." [1] The Divine Saviour is at once the elder brother, the centre, the pattern, the head, the life, the redeemer, and the lord of all the innumerable multitude of saved men "out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation." What a stupendous proof that mankind of every kindred and tongue and people and nation are one species!

IV. We come now to speak of the original condition of man, as to its equipments for religion, science, and art. Was that condition, or was it not, a condition of what is called civilization? The question has intimate connexion with some other great questions, and is a momentous one, both in itself and for them. But a previous question is implied by it, and requires to be settled—What is civilization? The answers given, either directly or by implication, are various and conflicting.

One opinion about civilization regards it as the social growth of human knowledge and experience, or as a developmental progress upward from barbarism. But that opinion simply shuts out the question as to the original condition of man, or forbids the discussion of it, or takes for granted that it is no question at all. A second opinion regards civilization as the outcome of an organic or physiological evolution, first throughout the ascent of species in the animal kingdom, and next throughout an ascent of varieties in the human race. But that opinion, either avowedly or by consequence, is grossly materialistic, and cannot be accepted by any believer in the proper intellectuality of man. It also is

[1] Phil. iii. 21.

Digitized by Google

no more and no other than a phase of the evolution and development theories respecting the origin of man, and vanishes at the touch of any one of the arguments which explode these theories. A third opinion identifies civilization with the elements of social polish and courteous behaviour. The most highly civilized man, according to this opinion, is the man who has the highest "good breeding," the most elegant manners, the finest physical demeanour, the most silken speech. But that man, as a man, may be either good, bad, or indifferent; as a member of society, may be either a thorough gentleman or thoroughly the reverse; and, as to religion morals, art, and science, may, as likely as not, be a hypocrite or an atheist, a cheat or a debauchee, an ignorant idler, and a stalking fool. A merely polite man may, as to at once mind, heart, and power of self-support, be an arrant savage. His external semblances are neither substantial realities nor an inner nature. As well, or better, might a fine contour, fine eyes, fine nose, fine mouth, be called civilization; for these are pleasant to look upon, and as practically useful, while they neither admit of being made a mask for depravity, nor are subject to continual variation by whim and fashion from country to country and from age to age. Good breeding, elegant manners, and a genteel address are no more civilization than moonshine is the world; and if they shimmer and glisten as moonshine does, they also do what moonshine does not—they hide things which are vile, horrible, and destructive.

A fourth opinion about civilization regards it as all a matter of art, and measures the degrees of it by ascent from the rudest methods of providing food and shelter to the most exquisite methods of gratifying the imagina-

Digitized by Google

tion. It divides the arts into the common and the fine; arranges all in a long gradation from the lowest practices of hunting, pasturing, and hut-making up to the highest achievements of architecture, sculpture, painting, poetry, and music; and pronounces any people to be scantily or mediumly or highly civilized, according to the place which they hold in that gradation. But this opinion either does not stand alone, so as to be an opinion in itself—either is held one way in theory and handled a different way in practice—or it ignores the connexion between art and science and betrays total ignorance of what art is. Any one art, from the lowest to the highest, presupposes knowledge and reasoning; any particular art is comparatively low or high, exactly in the degree in which it manifests knowledge and reasoning; and the very coarsest or simplest art is an art at all, or differs from the honeycomb-making of bees, the nest-building of birds, or any other instinctive operation of lower animals, solely on account of resting on knowledge and reasoning. Not the operativeness of man, therefore, but the intellectuality of man producing and guiding his operativeness, is what constitutes art. Hence can no amount of art, however various and rich, be in itself either the material or the measure of civilization.

A fifth opinion makes civilization identical with science. But this opinion is always indefinite, often ambiguous, and never adequate. It takes science sometimes as science only, sometimes as science and art conjointly, sometimes as one kind of speculative thought, sometimes as another kind of speculative thought, and scarcely ever as pure or genuine knowledge; and it has any measure of truth or falsehood exactly in the degree in which what it assumes to be

Digitized by Google

science is true or false. Science, in the sense of mere theory, may be either good or bad, or may tend either to civilize or to barbarize. Science, in the sense of any abstractions which withdraw attention from ordinary duties and active life, will tend only to make men dreamers, idlers, and fools. Science, in the sense of any speculative system which denies God's moral government and darkens the conscience, will inveigle men into a savagism really far more debasing, though seemingly much less gross, than that of ordinary barbarians. And science, in the sense of anything else which is unreal or untrue, or which ignores or misdirects man's powers of action or his capacities of adoring God and loving his fellow-men, will, in the proportion of its badness, destroy civilization and engender barbarism. Yet science of some badness or other, in some measure or other, is generally the science held forth in the opinion that science is civilization. Nor only so, but speculation in the lump, quasi-knowledge in the mass, anything or everything in thought, which has ever distinguished the nominally civilized of mankind from the nominally barbarous, is often the science held forth by that opinion. Chaldean astrology, Grecian philosophy, Chinese Confucianism, mediæval scholasticism, and modern evolutionism, positivism, and sensationalism, all alike pass with it for science. Its lights of civilization are all lambent things, whether they suffocate and destroy or not; as well the brimstone flame, the charcoal red heat, the gunpowder flash, and the volcano blaze, as the rays of the sun; and as well the midnight lamp of the experimentalist in his explosive laboratory, as the day-beams of the great luminary in beneficent circuit round the world. Hence has much of the reputed light of civilization among many peoples, in

Digitized by Google

many ages, been a mere glimmering of light, flowing from sources or accompanied with agencies awfully destructive to real civilization. Only true science or genuine knowledge, built on facts or realities, can truly civilize.

A sixth opinion identifies civilization with the fair, full, harmonious exercise of all man's powers and faculties. This is the correct opinion. It considers man as he is, in all that he is, what he was made for, what he is fitted for, and how he best or truly serves the end of his existence. It looks at his intrinsic constitution, at his extrinsic position, at his consociality, at his relation to all things around him, at the complexity of his powers, at the place he holds in duration of being, and at the entire circle of purpose which he is qualified to serve. It views him as neither a machine nor an animal nor a soul alone, but as all three in combination and not as fitted for only action or cognition or adoration, but as fitted for conjointly all the three. And it regards his civilization as simply the right outcome of at once his organic forces, his intellectual powers, and his moral faculties, or as the right practice of at once art, science, and religion. His specific or differential organization is as distinctly adapted to specific or differential life as is the specific or differential organization of any of the lower animals. His hands, for example, are constructed for the exercise of the arts as manifestly as the wings of a bird are constructed for flight. His intellect also controls his organization as directly and fully as a brute's instinct controls its organization; and his end of existence is defined as clearly by the right action of his intellect as is the end of a brute's existence by the right action of its instinct. Hence, as are flight, nest-building, and seed-pecking to

Digitized by Google

birds, so are the habits of civilization to man. Let these habits in him become as amply and purely the outcome of his constitution as those operations by them are the outcome of their constitution; and then, but not till then, will he be completely civilized.

But his intellect differs enormously from their instinct; and his fulfilment of the designs of his existence differs correspondingly from theirs. The intellect is not uniform or stationary; but it grows or expands, requires to be educated, and is capable either of very great and incessant improvement, or of very serious deterioration. It also is not merely functional or fitted to control the outward actions, but likewise abstract or fitted to carry on cognition and contemplation; and it exercises all its capacities of progress and change, for good or for evil, in connexion with both its functional and its abstract work. It likewise is not merely mental or fitted for all sorts of operations which relate to physical and to rational things, but also is moral or fitted for all the volitions and emotions which relate to right and wrong and to the worship of God; and it exercises all its capacities of progress and change for good or for evil, in connexion with the moral qualities of thoughts and actions, as constantly and thoroughly as in connexion with their rational qualities. It is not simply the analogue of instinct, doing for man's organisms what instinct does for the organisms of brutes; nor is it simply mind, doing also the work of storing thought, elaborating thought, and carrying thought into outward behaviour; but it is likewise soul, with intuitions of God's existence, of His law, of His tribunal, of accountability to Him hereafter, and ever projecting these intuitions or the consequents of them in reasonings and volitions and actions; and

Digitized by Google

in the whole of its composite character, as well in its aspect of soul as in its aspect of mind or in its aspect of the analogue of instinct, it undergoes change for better or for worse, and requires to reach the condition of a constant, fair, full, harmonious play of all its powers and faculties in order to its doing for a man in a man's condition in the world what instinct does for a brute in a brute's condition. Not till it reaches that condition throughout any people, do they serve the ends which they were made and fitted for; and not till then are they fully civilized. The human intellect, moreover, in consequence of the fall of Adam, or as every man may know from experience, is clouded, weakened, and inclined to evil by inherent moral pravity; and, in all its efforts for fulfilling the designs of man's existence, it has to fight against that pravity as a strong, constant, antagonistic force. Work as it may, therefore, toward clothing a man with civilization, it must work indeed in the spirit of art and in the spirit of science, but it must work vastly more in the spirit of religion. Art is a large part of civilization, science is a larger part, and religion is the largest.

What is often called civilization, then, is either not civilization at all or civilization in very meagre degree. Any discussion as to its origin or antiquity, therefore, would be either altogether useless or very slightly useful. If civilization be taken to mean a thing evolved out of animal organisms, from the monad through the ape to a far-advanced variety of man, it of course was never heard of till the nineteenth century, and even then became recognized by only a few savants; but as it is nothing and lies only as a nightmare on the hard-breathing breasts of those who dream about it, it possesses no

Digitized by Google

manner of interest for waking men. If, again, civilization be taken to mean genteelness of demeanour, it of course has been displaying its fitful fashions and practising its changeful courtesies, in endless variety, among many peoples, through many an age, and is always thought brightest and best in his own person by every man who has the latest style of it; but as it does not in the least affect any of the real ends of human existence, it may be left entirely to the study of those who can find nothing vital or important or really useful to think about. If, again, civilization be taken to mean the arts, from the lowest of the common to the highest of the fine, it of course has presented in past ages, as it presents now, a wonderful diversity among human populations; but as it has as numerous parts as there are numerous arts, and is based in each part on pre-existing knowledge, it could not be satisfactorily examined otherwise than along numerous different lines of inquiry, all terminating in previous questions respecting principles or information; and as it amounts in its entirety to no more than the smallest one of the three constituents of total civilization, or is aggregately unimportant in itself as compared with science and religion, it cannot repay the pains of a separate investigation. Whoever catechizes the arts alone on the subject of civilization, catechizes a body without a soul. If, again, civilization be taken to mean scienee, in the sense of anything or everything which has ever distinguished thinkers or theorists from the ordinary people around them, it of course has flitted along past ages pretty much as it flits along the present one; but as it has been and is more diversified than even the arts, and far more self-conflicting and far more difficult of

Digitized by Google

discrimination, it would require courses of examination far more numerous and searching than even the arts do; and as it much oftener than otherwise disjoins itself from facts or consists of sheer theories, and much oftener than otherwise unites itself with false religion or disregards or even opposes true religion, it requires to be everywhere cut asunder into true science and false science; and then, in only its minor section, does it prove to be either civilization or a civilizing force; while, in its major section, it is a rank, tricky, poisoning impostor, not only unworthy of inquiry, but deserving scorn and execration. Whoever goes amongst the sciences catechizing them about civilization, goes into a city of the plague, where some living men may speak to him, but where also dead men and charnel-houses may mortally infect him.

We are now on ground to face the question as to the original state of man. The question is not about art only, or science only, or religion only, but about the three combined. And no person who believes the Bible can hesitate for a moment how to answer it. The answer found there is unmistakable. "God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over ever living thing that moveth upon the earth. And

Digitized by Google

God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat; and to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat; and it was so."[1] Here are shown three distinctive things in man's original condition. First, he was specifically different from each and all of the animals that had been previously created. He was a new species, both of another order than any of theirs and vastly higher. He was not created "after his kind," as each previous species had been created "after its kind," to be self-contained, living only for itself, roaming round a narrow circle of instinct existence; but he was created after the image of "the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God," with powers, faculties, and purposes to live for everything around him, onward and for ever. Next, he bore the Divine image in aspects of intelligence, rectitude, and moral excellence. That he did so is taught here, substantially or inferentially, by what is said respecting his destination to subdue the earth, to garner its fruits, and to rule the lower animals; and also is taught directly in Col. iii. 10 and Eph. iv. 24, by what is said there respecting the image of God as restored or created again, at the new birth, in all sinners who believe in Christ. The image in them, though existing only in their "new man" side by side with their "old man," is there declared to consist of knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness; and it could not be either different in kind or less in extent, yet was likely to be

[1] Gen. i. 26–30.

Digitized by Google

much stronger in operation, as it existed in Adam's *whole man.* And the knowledge or intelligence, the righteousness or rectitude, the true holiness or moral excellence being after the Divine exemplar, how bright must have been the intelligence, how penetrating the rectitude, how glorifying to God the moral excellence! Here, in the first man, were the elements and forces of at once the noblest contemplation, the grandest action, and the most fervent adoration; equipments, full and strong, for at once science, art, and religion. And, next, he was put in a position for the immediate, complete, and constant exercise of his great powers and faculties. He was set to replenish the earth, to subdue it, to wield dominion over all the lower animals of both sea and land, to appropriate to himself all seeds and fruits, and to apportion to the land animals all sorts of herbage. How could he do these things, or even make an attempt to do them, otherwise than by possessing and exercising great art, large science, and much religion? He could colonize and cultivate only by means of much art and some science; he could understand the animals and govern them only by means of much science and some art; he could know the vegetable products and manipulate them only by means of mixed science and art; and he could rightly or prolongedly do any of these things, or any one of many other things involved in them or essential to them, only in the exercise of constant, fervent, thankful, devout trust in God. His position, his responsibilities, his employments, and consequently his equipments, were all concerned with things which would now be called the things of the highest civilization.

The account of Adam in the garden of Eden is all to the same effect. "The Lord God planted a garden

Digitized by Google

eastward in Eden, and there he put the man whom He had formed. The Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. And the Lord God brought every beast of the field and every fowl of the air unto Adam to see what he would call them; and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof."[2] The intercommunication between God and Adam, as indicated in these words and in the context of them, resembled intercommunication between man and man; so that, on Adam's part, for its closeness, its continuousness, and its necessarily high intelligence and devotion, it implied pure and exalted religion. His position in the divinely planted garden, in the midst of a rich diversity of vegetation, comprising "every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food," and in front of the wonderful assemblage of all sorts of animals brought thither by God, together with the obligation put upon him to cultivate all the plants and to name all the animals—that position required or presupposed him to understand the genera and habits and properties of at least a very large portion of the earth's flora and fauna, together with the climatic and local influences which affect them severally in their several kinds and places; and it therefore implied a quality and a quantity of knowledge nothing short of pure and exalted science. And his being "put into the garden to dress it and to keep it"—not to *learn* how to treat it, not to *acquire* experience how to manage it, but to begin at once to dress it and to keep it, in all the multitudinous ways of fine culture suitable to its diversity and ornature—required or presupposed the utmost acquaintance both

[2] Gen. ii. 8, 15, 19.

Digitized by Google

with the principles of horticulture, arboriculture, and agriculture, and with the methods of applying them effectively in practice; and it therefore implied a full knowledge both of these arts themselves and of all the other arts, such as metal-working, tool-working, and house-building, with which they are essentially connected.

But what about Adam after he fell into sin and was expelled from the garden? He, no doubt, lost all his innocence and much of both his knowledge and his art; but he still, as compared with the bulk of his descendants, remained highly civilized. He first of all got a new revelation, acquainting him with nothing less than the glorious scheme of redemption through a Saviour to come; he got that revelation not only in vocal utterance, telling him that he might become holy and blessed again, but also in the expressive symbols of sacrifice and the Shechinah, showing always how he might become holy and blessed again; and he possessed in that revelation the very same religious teaching which was afterwards extended into all the writings of the Book of God. He next, except for disturbance by sin, remained unchanged in intellect. He was the same mentally that he had been; he possessed the same reach of understanding; he continued to receive Divine communication in the same intellectual form; he retained remembrance or knowledge of the state of things in the garden; and if the new revelation made to him be presumed to have been less easy of comprehension than the subsequent full unfolding of it in the Bible, he must have had either a strength of thought or a store of ideas proportionate to the difficulty of understanding it. He also, as we shall immediately see, retained enough of his

Digitized by Google

practical knowledge to serve well the practical purposes of life; so that, however he may be viewed, he still had large acquaintance with science. And next he was set "to till the ground"[1]—not to be a hunter or a herdsman, but to be a husbandman; and, as the ground was now under curse for his sake, and was to bring forth thorns and thistles,[2] he would now require skill in the field quite as much as he formerly required it in the garden. His husbandry, too, was so comprehensive as to include the exercise of two distinct sets of both principle and practice; for it became separable, in the hands of his sons, into arable husbandry and pastoral husbandry.[3] Now, as we have said elsewhere, "the combined pursuit of these two husbandries, in a right way, on the same farm, is one of the highest achievements of modern agriculture, in the managing of any one set of fields; the separate pursuit of the two, on different farms, in a way to carry duly forward the interests of each, is an achievement equally high in the managing of any district of country; and either the one form of pursuit or the other gives full and constant play for the thousand practical complexities of at once chemical, meteorological, botanical, physiological, mechanical, and georgical knowledge. We may assume as much or as little of this knowledge as we please to have been possessed by fallen Adam; but we cannot contemplate him first carrying on the two husbandries himself, and next putting them separate for his sons, without seeing that his stock of it was not small." And his arts, of course, were proportionate to his knowledge; not merely the direct arts of husbandry, but also all the other arts which these involved.

"God made man upright, but they sought out many

[1] Gen. iii. 23. [2] Gen. iii. 17, 18. [3] Gen. iv. 2.

Digitized by Google

inventions." [1] The inventions, however, as the context shows, were all for evil. They were not a progression, but a retrogression. They consisted primarily in corrupting religion, and secondarily in corrupting science and art. They were altogether a decadence from high civilization towards barbarism, or thoroughly the reverse of an advance from barbarism toward civilization. They were begun by Cain, who substituted a cereal offering for a blood sacrifice, slew his brother, and departed from the presence of the Shechinah; and they were rapidly multiplied by his descendants. Cain, nevertheless, "builded a city;" Jabal, in the sixth descent from him, "was the father of such as dwell in tents;" Jubal, the brother of Jabal, "was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ;" and Tubalcain, the half-brother of Jabal, was "an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron." [2] They all were corrupters of religion, yet all retained much civilizational knowledge and art; and all likewise appear to have turned that knowledge and that art to some bad purpose. Cain's "city," most probably, like the subsequent "city and tower" of Babel, was designed for some object of ambition or defiance, so as to be a corrupted thing in comparison with peaceful habitations. Jabal's movement was not to make tents, but to "dwell in them" amid herds of cattle, in the manner of nomadic life; and therefore may have been mainly a degrading of domestic habits and textile manufacture from the uses of a husbandman to the uses of a Bedouin. Jubal's enterprise is not said to have been the inventing of the harp and organ, but is said to have been "the handling" of them; and, whether it invented them or not, may, as to its character or its

[1] Eccles. vii. 29. [2] Gen. iv. 17–22.

Digitized by Google

influence or the reason of its being recorded, have consisted in perverting them to frivolous and dissipating uses. Tubalcain's designation would be better rendered "a hammerer, a universal workman, in copper and iron;" it describes him not as bringing the metals into use, but as working them in new ways and with sweeping effect; and while probably pointing to the fabrication of many new kinds of tools and implements, it probably also points, in particular, to the fabrication of swords and other destructive weapons. Thus the very things in the sacred narrative which many writers quote as indication of progress in the arts, are really indications of decline in civilization. They were, no doubt, new things; they, no doubt, made additions to the world's stock of objects and usage; they certainly were "inventions;" but either seen in themselves or seen especially in connexion with the Cainites' corruption of religion, they were inventions in the bad sense, springing more or less from depravity, and deteriorating the spirit and the aim of pristine knowledge and pristine art.

The descendants of Seth spread immediately around the place of the Shechinah, and appear to have long maintained the pure worship of God. Enoch, the contemporary of Jabal, Jubal, and Tubalcain, "was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him; for before his translation, he had this testimony, that he pleased God."[1] He also, in his lifetime, received a new revelation, testified against the "inventions" or corruptions which had arisen among the Cainites, and "prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of His saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that

[1] Heb. xi. 5.

Digitized by Google

are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." [1] And the Sethites in general so far resembled Enoch as to be called "the sons of God;" while the Cainites, in contradistinction to them, were called "the sons of men." [2] And in so far as they remained right in religion, in so far also they, no doubt, remained right in secular knowledge and in art. Their civilization continuing good in the most important one of its three constituents, would continue good also in its other two constituents. As, for a time, they did not follow the Cainites in perverting religion; so, for a time, they would not follow them in perverting science and art. Yet they eventually followed them, or rather mingled with them, in perverting all the three. "The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all whom they chose;" [3] and then Sethites and Cainites rushed all headlong together into one abyss of degeneracy. And thence "the wickedness of man was great in the earth; and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart," as well about secular things as about sacred things, "was only evil continually." [4]

Here ended the first cycle of man's social history in the world. His primal post-paradise condition was a condition of high religion, high knowledge, and high art —a condition of complete and high civilization; and it degenerated first in one of two lines of descent, and next in the other line of descent, into a condition of gross barbarism. "The earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence; and God

[1] Jude 14, 15. [2] Gen. vi. 2, 4. [3] Gen. vi. 2. [4] Gen. vi. 5.

Digitized by Google

looked upon the earth, and behold, it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupted His way upon the earth."[1] So terrible was the corruption, so unmitigated the barbarism, that the only cure for it was to sweep away the whole population, except one family, with a flood. And here was seen, for the first time, in the clearest light and on the greatest scale, the real working of the social proclivities of man. Any person who looks at this first cycle of human history, who sees here the distinct, steady, strong retrogression from a civilized state to a barbarous one, and then talks of civilization as a thing which men had not originally and which they slowly produced for themselves—what is that person? Simply and flatly a disbeliever of the Bible, an infidel, and a very bold infidel too. What he has to attempt, before he is entitled to be listened to, is not the paltry thing of propping his theory about pristine barbarism, but the unutterably awful thing of impugning the stupendous evidences of revelation. We must meet him, however, on his own ground. But, before doing that, let us look at the Bible's account of the next cycle of the social history of man.

Noah, notwithstanding the universal defection around him, retained much of the pristine civilization.[2] He had much true religion, much science, and much art; and he got new revelations, both before the flood and after it.[3] He was to be the father of the new world, the source of all the postdiluvian populations, the founder of the reconstructed race of mankind; and he was qualified for his position both by as much of the original civilization as he retained and by the contents of the new

[1] Gen. vi. 11, 12. [2] Gen. vi. 8; Heb. xi. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 5.
[3] Gen vi. 13–21; vii. 1–4; viii. 20–22; ix. 1–17.

Digitized by Google

revelations which he received. His religion is apparent in his intercommunication with God, in his faith in God, in his preaching of righteousness, and in God's acceptance of his sacrifices. His science is apparent in his building of the ark, in his classifying of the animals, in the astronomical elements of the revelations made to him, in the niceness of his botany at the planting of the vineyard, in his prophetic forecasts of the social conditions of the three lines of his offspring, and in multitudes of necessarily collateral matters. His arts are apparent in his preparations for the building of the ark—especially the furnishing of tools, the felling of trees, the transport of timber, the forming of dock-ground, the collecting of the animals, and the storing of provisions and provender; in the operations of building the ark—especially the laying of a hull 547 feet long, the raising of a four-storied structure 91 feet wide and 54 feet high, the arranging of compartments for men and beasts and stores, and the constructing of appliances for ventilation and cleanliness; in the adjusting of matters after the subsidence of the flood—especially the departing from the ark, the settling of the colony, the erecting of the altar, and the erecting of dwellings; and in the re-institution of industry and social order—especially the forming of farms, the planting of a vineyard, the finding out of "the true vine," the proper commencing of the many details of culture, the modelling of the hundred things of domestic economy, the establishing of the old manufactures in textile fabrics and in metals, and the erecting of the mechanism of social government. All these things, and far more than these, if we look consideringly at it, are seen to be distinctly indicated in the record. These things, in religion, in science, in art, and in a fine harmony of the

Digitized by Google

three, together with many other things which these essentially imply, were the stock of moral, mental, and social equipment with which postdiluvian man began his career. Who will call these barbarism? They were equal, and much more than equal, to the highest civilization of the present day. They, no doubt, wanted some grand enlargements which subsequently emerged; but they just as certainly wanted also the enormous admixtures of evil with which subsequent civilizations became debased. They likewise had a greater fitness than any modern civilizations could have had for the needs of the early ages; and they lacked nothing in completeness of equipment for every purpose of man's existence in the world.

Then, in so far as the Noahic civilization wanted any good enlargements which afterwards arose, how or when or whence did these arise? Were they simply a growth out of what already existed? a progress onward in the immediately following generations? a product purely and entirely of unaided human reason? Not at all. The civilization very soon underwent change, indeed; but it, for a long time, underwent change altogether in the opposite way. The descendants of Noah, through many a generation, improved it not a hair's breadth, but steadily and broadly debased it. They ran a course of deterioration very similar to that which had been run by the antediluvians. They broke early into two divisions not unlike the Cainites and the Sethites; and these two divisions, exactly like the Cainites and the Sethites, went down two lines of decadence, respectively quick and slow, and eventually uniting.[1] The one division, too, the Cushites, began, as the Cainites had begun, by

[1] Gen. x. 8–12; xi. 1–9.

Digitized by Google

corrupting religion, and proceeded, as the Cainites had proceeded, by perverting science and art into purposes of ambition, vain-glory, and worldly aggrandisement. Their signalizing achievement was the erection of splendid cities and stupendous architectural masses, and that, if we look closely at the Bible's account of it, appears to have been done with prodigious labour and wondrous skill. Their recorded works were done in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Tigris; and, whether seen in the light of recent archæological researches or seen merely in the light of identity of Cushite with Cushite, these appear to have been of twin character and twin age to unrecorded works in Egypt, either the most ancient monuments still existing there, or monuments immediately preceding. And the original great structures on the Euphrates and the Tigris would, no doubt, have proved as enduring as the great ancient monuments on the Nile, had they not been shaken and overthrown by the shocks and reconstructions of successive great empires. But very great though they were, all were the outcome of skill only—of skill divorced from pure religion—of skill employed for proud, ambitious, earthly ends; and therefore, while exhibiting how very much of science and art remained, and how very noble these had been, they also exhibited how sadly and deeply the spirit and the aim of the civilization had been lost. Already, when these structures were erected, the worship of the true God was passing into the worship of creatures, the rites of holy sacrifice connected with the Divine scheme of redemption were passing into rites of sacrifice to idols, the exalting study of astronomy was passing into the debasing study of astrology, and the arts of peace and beneficence were passing into the arts of war and oppression.

Digitized by Google

The other or larger division of Noah's descendants, on to about the time of the development of Cushite idolatry or Chaldeeism, figure in the sacred narrative little otherwise than in a summary account of their dispersion, and are traceable by archæological research little farther than in general and faint outlines. They spread far and wide into numerous separate communities, from the valley of the Euphrates to the entire circumference of the countries which became included in the ancient empires; and, as seen in the limited light of history and of archæology, they appear to have declined more or less rapidly from civilization, very much in the degree of the relative distance of their settlements from the original centre. Those who remained near the Euphrates suffered little cause of declension, except such as existed in their own minds; while those who migrated to great distances, especially those who went so far as to the Asian central highlands, the African mountain region, and the Atlantic and Baltic seaboards, suffered also the loss of communication with the centre, the assumption of new habits in adaptation to new climates, and the struggle for maintenance amid new and great difficulties of place and occupation. Remains or vestiges of the pristine civilization, in all its three departments of religion, science, and art, are found by archæologists always most in the vicinity of the original centre, and always dwindling into decadence or toward savagism nearly in the ratio of the distance thence onward to the circumference. Yet the very communities who settled nearest the centre did not, in the aggregate, leave monuments of such magnitude and number as those left by the Cushites. They may be presumed to have been less ambitious, more peaceful, more domestic,

Digitized by Google

less demonstrative than the Cushites, and therefore to have used science and the arts in ways more useful and less showy. Their religion, also, in the degree in which it remained pure, would exist far more in spirit than in form, and would seek outward expression far more in devout behaviour than in costly fanes. Their minds, nevertheless, were under the influence of the common pravity, and went surely and steadily away from the light and vigour of the Noahic civilization. The best of them seem to have been the Arphaxadites or Eberites, settled in Mesopotamia; and these, so early as the time of Terah, in the ninth descent from Noah, passed into the idolatry of the Chaldeans. Exactly the parallel of what had happened with the Sethites and the Cainites happened now with the Arphaxadites and the Cushites. True religion was superseded by false religion; and therefore the entire civilization was passing into barbarism.

Had not a new revelation been given, mankind would have gone on rotting till they became extinct. The old revelation as yet was entirely oral, and was all undergoing thorough perversion. Men were everywhere "changing the truth of God into a lie, and worshipping and serving the creature more than the Creator."[1] They "became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened; professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."[2] Nothing short of a renewal of the revelation, in more durable form than before, with Divine institutes to exhibit and promulgate it, could restore them again, or any of them, to a condition of fitness for serving the ends of their existence. God, therefore, called Abram, the son of Terah, to the

[1] Rom. i. 25. [2] Rom. i. 21, 22.

Digitized by Google

land of Canaan; constituted him there the father of "a peculiar people, a holy nation;" gave to him revelations for guiding the infancy of that nation; gave further revelations to his grandson, Jacob; extended the revelations, when the nation became fully grown, into a written record, by the hand of Moses; and then, with ample institutes for constantly and minutely exhibiting the teachings of the record, put the nation into fixed possession of Canaan. That land was the finest possible centre for the populations of the world, as these populations were then distributed; and that record, though held by "the peculiar people, the holy nation," was a record for all men. The light of restored civilization radiated thence, more or less, through all the surrounding regions. Intercourse with the Hebrews was held not only by the small adjacent nations, the Edomites, the Moabites, the Ammonites, the Ishmaelites, the Syrians, and the Phœnicians, but also by the distant nations, the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, and the Persians, the largest and most powerful then in the world; and that intercourse was so constant, so interpenetrating, and often so entirely friendly, that it could not fail to effect a continuous diffusion of much of the Hebrew knowledge among a very large proportion of mankind. Portions of Scripture also were expressly addressed to the surrounding nations, both near and remote; and were, no doubt, conveyed to them, and disseminated among them. Living men, inspired by God, and conveying messages from God, likewise taught personally among the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Egyptians, and the Persians. The deportation of the ten tribes into Assyria, too, may have done something for, at least, the propagation of the contents of Scrip-

Digitized by Google

ture; and, at all events, the deportation of the Jews into Babylonia did much. Nebuchadnezzar carried away "all the princes, and all the mighty men of valour, and all the craftsmen and smiths," leaving only "the poorest sort of the people of the land;"[1] he selected for promotion to places of trust in his court, the best of the princes' sons, who were "skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science;"[2] and he was brought, in consequence, to the acknowledging of the true God, and to the adoption of great, wise, and good measures for the benefit of his subjects. Darius, Cyrus, and Artaxerxes pursued a similar course, and were brought to a similar issue. Can we doubt that many of the nobles under them, and some monarchs after them, imbibed a kindred spirit? The light of a new and vast civilization, in the full blaze of at once religion, science, and art, radiated from Canaan all round, from the time of Joshua till the time of the captivity; took effect very signally on Nineveh, and most probably took effect, more or less, on other cities; and then, at the captivity, was transferred bodily to the centre of the greatest empire then existing, shone there right upon the darkness which had been settling and deepening there ever onward from the commencment of Chaldeeism, and sent forth such brilliance and such force as almost instantly to drive much of the darkness away. Here were at once a great revival of civilization, an epoch of enlargements in it, and a broad instance of the fluctuation which has ever since characterized it.

But were the Hebrews really a highly civilized people? The fashion, among Bible-neglecting savants and among some inadvertent Christians, has been to say that they

[1] 2 Kings xxiv. 14. [2] Dan. i. 3, 4.

Digitized by Google

were not; but that fashion sprang from idle fancy, and is opposed to fact. True religion was always among the Hebrews, in their Scriptures; always among them, in their symbolic institutions; always among them, in the faith and practice of at least a few of their own number; and often among them, in the faith and practice of great numbers. True science also was among them; not indeed of the speculative character which it had among the best of their contemporaries; but science harmonious with their religion, free from follies and vagaries, suited directly to the genuine ends of human existence, and purer, brighter, larger, and more vigorous than the most boasted science of ancient Greece or Rome. True astronomy, for example, after having been extinguished by the Chaldeans, in their lurid and lying system of astrology, reappeared in the Hebrew Scriptures, and gave constant practical lessons both for elevating the thoughts adoringly to the infinite Creator, and for preventing mistakes and idolatries in reference to the celestial orbs; and that science, being the greatest one of all the sciences, indicates the tone or character which belonged to the rest. A true astronomy, or a proximately true one, prevailed likewise among the Greeks for three or four generations after the time of Pythagoras; but it almost certainly was obtained by intercourse with the Hebrews; and it comported so ill with the spirit of the Greek philosophy that Aristotle, the greatest of the Greek savants, "the monster of intellect without any religious feeling," inflicted upon it a blow which he meant to be deadly, and which had the effect of at least making it speechless till the time of Copernicus. Arts, also, of the kinds worthy to be called arts —not such as ministered to robbery and oppression, or

Digitized by Google

to frivolity and dissipation, but such as ministered to industry and benevolence, to health and comfort and joyousness—were in high condition among the Hebrews. Their agriculture, as to land-tenure, extent of holdings, and many regulating principles, was an appendage to their religion, associated with the symbols of their highest faith, and could not be otherwise than excellent. Their architecture—long and currently described by most classes of writers as poor and paltry—was proved by the recent explorations at Jerusalem to have been really wonderful. Their sculpture or carving, though restricted to subjects which should not subserve or suggest idolatry, is shown by a passage in Josephus, respecting Solomon's "house of the forest of Lebanon," to have been exquisite. Their embroidery was elaborate; their music was gorgeous; their poetry was sublime; and their other arts, as indicated by the Bible's notices of their implements, their armour, their dresses, and their personal ornaments, possessed a breadth and a beauty which only high civilization could have produced.

These highly civilized Hebrews, then, were dispersed through the empires of successively the Assyrians, the Babylonians, and the Persians. A few of them, indeed, returned to Palestine; and these and their descendants for a time made that land once more a great centre of civilization. But the great majority of the Hebrews remained in the countries to which they had been deported; became scattered, in colonies, throughout the provinces of the Persian empire, "from India even unto Ethiopia;" and were so favoured by Artaxerxes, in opposition to a great conspiracy against them, that "they had joy and gladness, a feast, and a good day; and many of the people became Jews, for the fear of

Digitized by Google

the Jews fell upon them."[1] And who can doubt that the Jews then, as interspersed among so vast a people, were like bits of leaven in masses of dough, and imparted a civilizing influence to no small portions of the world's degenerated population? Their descendants also remained in the same countries unto the Greek and the Roman times; and multitudes of emigrants, both from these and from the Jews in Palestine, likewise went westward, along both sides of the Mediterranean, and planted numberless town-quarters all the way as far as to Rome and Carthage. Jews, in the time of Augustus and long before it, formed sections of the population of almost every considerable town in Northern Africa, in the Levant, in Asia Minor, in Greece, in Macedonia, in Italy, and in some countries beyond; and they lived there in distinct and separate quarters of their own, and differed widely from their ancestors in the times of the Hebrew kings by continuing steadfast in the monotheistic, Messianic, and other teachings of their sacred books. And every community of them was a knot in a great ganglion of civilizing influence, extending nearly across the whole populated earth. Their presence in some regions and their absence in others, or the light of their holy books in some countries and the want of that light in others, almost trace the lines of demarcation between what is called, in the ordinary histories of Greek and Roman times, the civilized world and the barbarous world. They were, in no trivial degree, "the salt of the earth." And so deeply did they impregnate the heathens with the very leading thought of the Hebrew faith, respecting a glorious Deliverer who was to arise, that the

[1] Esther i. 1, viii. 17, ix. 2.

Digitized by Google

expected Deliverer became literally "the Desire of all Nations." No wonder can be felt by any man who looks fairly at the Hebrew dispersion, that civilizations sprang up and spread in Persia and Greece and Ptolemaic Egypt and Roman Italy; but wonder deep and strong may be felt that the civilizations were so small—that they consisted chiefly in theoretic speculation and luxurious art—that they comprised so little of true religion, sound ethics, pure philosophy, and beneficent practice—and that they were mixed so largely with falsehood, folly, and vice. The world was a seething mass of wrong and right, ever polluted at the surface by wrong bubbling up from below, and never becoming well purified by right acting upon it from above.

Nor did the wrong merely work against the right, but it became once more the larger quantity and the stronger force. Both the Jews and the partially civilized Gentiles repeated the old process of declension towards barbarism. The Jews, as well in Palestine as throughout the world, passed rapidly and extensively from pure religion into formalism and phariseeism, from pure science into the Greek speculative philosophy, from pure art into the practices of the surrounding heathens. The Greeks gradually renounced or forgot the best portions of such civilization as had come to them; and the Romans, though alertly catching up for a time much good knowledge and art, soon converted these mainly into means of conquest, luxury, and vice. The entire world became darkened again, altogether corrupted, "full of habitations of cruelty." The old light, indeed, was still over it, but had been hid by thick foggy condensations of the moistures from many waters, and went down to the horizon in "a cloudy and dark day." Another night,

Digitized by Google

like the night of the antediluvians and like the night of the Chaldee time, came on. "Darkness covered the earth, and gross darkness the people." A new day was needed. Another revelation became essential. And this time He who was "in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, took upon Him the form of a servant"[1] to give it. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners had spoken in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, spake unto us in these last days by his Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds."[2] "The Sun of Righteousness then arose, with healing in His rays."[3] And then "the people who sat in darkness saw great light; and to them who sat in the region and shadow of death, light sprang up."[4] Christ shed forth the highest religion with the richest splendour, the noblest knowledge with the grandest wisdom, the purest principles of practice with the strongest force. His apostles went forth to all lands; Divine influence went with them to direct their utterance and energize their labours; new Scriptures were given, to explain the old, and to bring "life and immortality" fully to light; and all the great cities of the world, Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Athens, Corinth, Rome, Alexandria, and others, were constituted centres of civilization for the regions around them. Christianity was then set up and developed; and Christianity, in the opinion of all classes of men, even in the opinion of the stoutest advocates of pristine savagism, has ever since been the greatest civilizing power in the earth.

Our inquiry from the Bible, as to the origin of civilization or as to what was the original social condition of

[1] Phil. ii. 6, 7. [2] Heb. i. 1, 2. [3] Mal. iv. 2. [4] Matt. iv. 16.

Digitized by Google

mankind, has thus been very long; but it could not well be shorter. It involved many details; and it led through long periods, and over much ground; it dealt with all with an authority which cannot be gainsaid by any believer in revelation; it elicited information from a book, or a long series of books, which even infidels are bound to regard as of far superior value to any other sources of information; and it has brought out a decision, clear and full, not only that a civilized condition was the original condition of man, but that civilization is a gift from God, that it has ever tended to deteriorate in man's use of it, and that it has alternately grown worse or grown better according as communities have or have not got renewals of it from revelational influence. The Bible's teaching about it is all the greater for having a historical form. The history, of course, comes no further down than the Bible itself comes; but the Bible's history here, as everywhere else, is didactic. It involves doctrines and contains principles; and, by means of these, it explains civilization, as to what it is, how it works, and how it is worked upon, as well in the Christian times as in the times which went before. All persons, therefore, who believe the Bible and attend to its teachings must be convinced that men originally were equipped for every purpose of religion, science, and art by direct instruction from God, and that men in every age or country or condition are truly civilized exactly in the degree in which they receive and follow the influences of God's revealed truth.

Many considerations outside of the Bible lead to the same conclusion; and these, for sake of the rejectors of revelation, have now to be adduced. They are very various; they run through many questions of anthropo-

Digitized by Google

logy, physiology, sociology, and political economy ; they touch the core of questions relative to man's moral accountability, his intellectuality, and the insufficiency of unaided reason to guide him through the difficulties of life ; they embrace views of almost all history ; they run into many matters of ethnology and archæology ; they comprise deductions of pure logic, or summaries of high opinion, from great aggregates of facts ; they include counterparts or contrasts to the defects, the inconsistencies, the absurdities, the impossibilities in the theories or representations of the advocates of the originally savage condition of man ; they are altogether so numerous and expansive that more than a meagre outline of them, or selection from them, cannot be attempted within our limits. What we shall say about them is little else than a jotting ; yet is all a jotting of strong points, and can easily be reasoned out by reflecting readers.

Firstly, then, the unsuitedness of savagism to the full and fair play of the human faculties is evidence that savagism was not man's original condition. Every organized being, whether plant or animal, came into existence under circumstances exactly suited to the complete exercise of its functions. Whether a plant in sea or marsh or alpine height or temperate valley or torrid plain, or whether an animal in ocean or river or any particular climate or any speciality of place or feeding-ground, each is admitted to have normally or primarily arisen precisely where and how it might best accomplish the ends of its organization. Any one found in circumstances unsuited to the complete and vigorous exercise of its organisms is known to have been removed from its native habitat ; and any one

Digitized by Google

artificially removed from that habitat, either will degenerate or must have artificially supplied to it whatever appliances for health and growth were lost to it by its removal. A law of reciprocal fitness between specific constitution and outward circumstances pervades all the organic world ; and is as constant and stringent as any law of life, or rather, is itself one grand epitome of the laws of life. And this law cannot be less in man than in plant or lower animal. It is as necessary in him as in them for all the mere physical purposes of life; and is necessary in him also for the intellectual and the moral purposes, dependent on the physical ones ; so that it must be as strong in him as in them, and far more extensive. But let savages be tested by it, and they are seen at once to be far removed from man's normal, native, or original condition. They possess few of the appliances for entire human well-being — few of the means for living and acting accordantly with their constitutional powers ; and they possess even these few defectively, sparsely, and fitfully. They obviously, therefore, are in widely different circumstances from those in which men originally lived. As a phanerogam that cannot flower is out of its native habitat ; or as a quadruped that cannot propagate its species is away from its native clime ; so a savage man, who cannot give moderate play to his intellectual and moral powers, is far away from the condition of his earliest progenitors.

Secondly, the difference between brute instinct and human intellect is evidence that man must have received equipments for civilization from God. All the lower animals, in their several species, each in its own way, are fully equipped by instinct for every purpose

Digitized by Google

of their existence. All burrow, dig, or build, as they severally require for shelter; and all select wholesome substances, and reject unwholesome ones, as they severally require for food. They never fail and never err, either for the right use of their organisms or for the complete attainment of their ends of life. Instinct guides them perfectly. And instinct in them is the correlative of intellect in man. But intellect, though an unspeakably higher endowment than instinct, is higher chiefly in its progressiveness, its dependence on intrinsic elevating aid, its moral faculties, and its constant references to Deity. It is characterized fully more by capacities than by powers; and it requires its capacities to be supplied in order to its powers being exercised. It does not, as instinct does, emerge in completeness for its work, once for all and fixedly; but it needs enlightenment, teaching, training from the first; and it continues to need them in order to its continuing to progress. It cannot, without these, do even its lowest work in any man now; and it could not, without these, have done even its lowest work in pristine men at the beginning. Had the first men been destitute of communicated thought, of instruction, of what could have come to them only by revelation, they would have had no knowledge how to contrive things for shelter, how to select nutritious substances for food, how to catch or manage the lower animals for domestication, or how to fabricate tools and implements for these and other ends. They, therefore, would soon have perished; and they also, during such short time as they lived, would have failed utterly to discharge the purely intellectual, purely moral, and properly devotional functions of their being. The analogue of brute and man, of instinct and intellect, of the abori-

Digitized by Google

ginal lower animals being represented in a great posterity, and of the aboriginal men being no less represented in a great posterity, is sure proof that the original condition of intellect was as complete for every purpose of man's being, and therefore for every purpose of civilization, as the condition of instinct at any time has been for every purpose of a brute.

Thirdly, the mere precurrence of instruction to even the lowest elements of civilization now is evidence that there was a precurrence of it at the beginning. Every human creature now, from the lowest to the highest conditions of society, requires to be taught how to act both individually and socially—even how to eat, how to clothe, how to cleanse, how to speak, how to do any other of the most common things of life; and every human creature must no less have required to be taught these common things, and far more the higher things, from the first. The very theory of aboriginal savagism is obliged to assume that pristine men had capacity to learn, that they benefited by such capacity, that they did learn, and learn well. But whence came the capacity? whence the information for occupying it? whence the force for working it into power and action? Mere capacity either was a nothing in itself, or was a correlation to an intrinsic something which should occupy and stimulate it. Mere capacity was no more to the first man or to the first man's son than it is to any human creature now. Mere capacity required instruction quite as much in the pristine men as it has required it in any subsequent men. Mere capacity, too, would have been a solecism in creation. Wherever a fitness for a thing or a need for a thing exists, the thing to fit it or the thing which it needs also exists. The eye

Digitized by Google

was formed to see light, and it gets light; the ear was formed to hear sounds, and it gets sounds; and as the human intellect was formed with capacity to receive information, it no doubt, from the beginning onward, got information. The simple existence of that capacity in the first man is constructive proof, clear and strong, that he received from his Creator sufficient enlightenment for all the purposes of his existence,—and received it not for his own use only, but for that also of his offspring.

Fourthly, the prominence of true religion over science and art is evidence that all civilization must have originated in Divine instruction. That prominence was elicited in our inquiry as to what civilization is. True religion was there shown to be a larger civilizational element than either science or art, and also to be essential to the purity and vigour of the other elements. But it either is utterly ignored in the theory of aboriginal savagism, or is superseded by some outcome of mere reason; and in either case, it is put aside with the effect of making civilization impossible. The ignoring of it is tantamount to the ignoring of the very elements of civilization, or to the ignoring of what man constitutionally is, and of what he is capable of; and yet, not simply the ignoring of it, but the ignoring of religion of any sort, runs through nine-tenths or more of all the advocacies of aboriginal savagism; and this, therefore, both renders these advocacies absurd, and virtually proves the opposites of them to be true. And the substituting of any outcome of reason for religion only adds wildness to absurdity. Few writers have tried to represent religion as an outcome of reason, or as other than either an outcome of man's moral intuitions or as

Digitized by Google

an outcome of revelation from God; and none of the few who have set it forth as an outcome of reason have tried to represent it as a primary element of civilization, or as originally concurrent with the earliest arts, or as more than a product of man's alleged intellectual progress onward from alleged pristine savagism. All they say about it, in connexion with man's original condition, amounts to the same thing, involves the same consequences, brings out the same conclusions, as the expelling of religion altogether from the notion of civilization; while all they say about it, on its own account, amounts, at the same time, to the wildest contradiction of universal experience and universal history. When or where was ever a religion ever produced by mere reason? Religions many have arisen from corruption or repudiation of revelation; but a religion in the absence of revelation, or without reference to revelation, has arisen never. The several forms of infidelity are the nearest approximations to such a religion; and all these, partly substance and mainly shadow, owe their entire substance to the adoption of some of the teachings of revelation, and their entire shadow to the denial of others of its teachings. True religion, whether existing anywhere pretty fully as a whole, or whether scattered elsewhere in obscured or corrupted fragments, all originated directly and purely in revelation; and being both the greatest element in genuine civilization and the force which rightly sustains and properly invigorates the other elements, it proves all civilization to have originated in revelational instruction.

Fifthly, the mental and moral condition of savages is not a condition out of which civilization can flow, and therefore was not the condition of primeval man.

Digitized by Google

Savages, of course, can be civilized, but they must be civilized from without. They can learn true religion, science, and art; but they must be taught them by foreign teachers. They never can civilize themselves. They are so sluggish and indolent that they never rise to exertion, except transiently, under some strong temporary exigency. They are so improvident that they never forecast any future needs beyond the measure of present circumstances. They are so brutal that they always content themselves with very low necessaries of existence, and never feel incitement to invention or discovery. They are so deeply heathenish that they totally want the animus of true religion, and the energizing spirit of all true science and art. They are even so indocile that, when they come within the sphere of foreign teaching, they learn reluctantly and slowly. Many of their most cherished customs, also, are so intensely artificial, in ways antagonistic to civilization, as to present strong barriers to the inroad of instruction. Their state is not simply a state of want of civilization, but a state of opposition to it. Their usages not merely exclude true religion, useful knowledge, good order, and proper art, but powerfully resist them. They paint or tattoo their skins, mutilate their bodies, wear fantastic ornaments, practise obscenities, formalize licentiousness, confide in fetishes, maintain multitudes of abominations systematically, approvingly, ardently; and cannot be dragged away from their vile, degrading, beastly customs by anything less than a strong extrinsic moral force. Such is the mental and moral condition of savages, as might easily be shown by quotations from authentic accounts of all savage communities, past or present, in all parts of the globe; and

Digitized by Google

most manifestly it is a condition entirely the reverse of what must have been the original social condition, whence flowed the ancient civilizations of mankind.

Sixthly, the physical condition of savages is not a condition out of which civilization can flow, and therefore was not the condition of primeval man. Savage communities, in general, have a physique exceedingly inferior to that of civilized communities. Their stature, their muscular strength, and especially their brain, are generally of a low type. And the more savage any particular community is, the worse commonly is their entire physique. Yet, as we showed in a former section, all savages are descended from the same primal human stock as the most highly civilized communities. Whence, then, have they their low stature, their bad conformation, their narrow brow, their small brain? Obviously from degeneracy. The cerebral organs in any community, through a course of descents, control or determine the whole organization; and these, in the case of savages, have been misused, perverted, repressed into a condition of impairment, shrunkenness, and comparative inactivity. These organs are the handmaids of the mind; they are the mediums of all the mind's working, either for social progress or for social retrogression; and wherever they have been worked backward, and are still in the state of being worked backward, they cannot of themselves work forward. The same intrinsic influences which have made them degenerate can only go on to make them more degenerate. Nothing but extrinsic influence to rouse them, to re-direct them, to carry them along in a new course, can turn them away from savagism and lead them on to civilization. Such extremely degraded savages as the Hottentots, the Papuans, and the

Digitized by Google

Fuegians, with the lowest type of head, are manifestly far beyond all reach of improvement, except by force of foreign influence; and even such savages as the Maories, with heads little or nothing inferior to the heads of Europeans, and with a docility incomparably greater than that of most other savages, have never been able to make a single move in the direction of self-civilization. Obviously, therefore, the condition of savages is the reverse of the condition of primeval man.

Seventhly, the traditions of all ancient civilized nations represent their civilization not as native or indigenous, but as derived from supernal powers or as introduced by foreign benefactors. Traditions of a pristine golden age, of oracles from heaven, of divinely instituted propitiatory sacrifice, of Divine deliverance for the human race at a general deluge, and of other obscured great facts of the true religion, abound in the initial or elementary stages of their mythologies. Traditions of Divine communication or Divine performance occur in the commencing annals of their philosophies. Greek traditions ascribed the introduction of the use of fire to the superhuman Prometheus; Greek traditions also ascribed the introduction of agriculture and other arts to the foreigners Triptolemus and Cadmus; and even Peruvian traditions ascribed the introduction of the useful arts to a person whom they regarded as the offspring of the sun. Similar traditions have been everywhere. All traditions, as to the origin of whatever any peoples have deemed to be their noblest characteristics, have ascribed it either directly to supernal powers, or mediately to some human being who came from a great distance, or who was divinely directed. Now, though no one tradition, especially on a fanciful

Digitized by Google

or trivial subject, is worthy of much consideration, yet such traditions as we have here possess all the force of irresistible demand upon our attention. They are not records, indeed, and have all the cloudiness and the contortedness which distinguish traditions from records; but they are so universal, so concurrent, so unopposed by any contrary traditions, so concerned with all the highest interests of the world's ancient populations, and so utterly humbling to the pride which might have aroused each of the populations to proclaim itself self-civilized, that they carry indomitably within them the evidence of being substantially true. Let them simply be freed from the cloudiness and the contortedness which belong to them as traditions; or let them simply pass through that alembic which any expert archæologist employs for separating intermingled fable from native fact; and they are then clear evidence that every ancient civilization was derived from a prior, pristine, divinely given civilization.

Eighthly, the history of civilization, as read in the records of all civilized nations, of any kinds or degrees of civilization, ancient or modern, is all adverse to the theory of self-civilization in any people, and all conducive to the belief that a civilized condition was the condition of primeval man. It exhibits everywhere a tendency of civilization to sink under intrinsic forces, nowhere a power to rise under intrinsic action, and anywhere a capacity to rise only by extrinsic influence. It shows that all ancient civilized nations, Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Persia, Greece, Rome, Arabia, passed from a state of high knowledge and high art to a state of semi-barbarism. It shows that never did any savage nation rise to the possession of good social order, literature, or

Digitized by Google

fine industry, otherwise than either by derivation of them from a previous enlightened people, or by importation of at least the elements of them from some foreign seat of civilization. It shows that, even since the fall of the Roman empire, many peoples have descended, by their own weight, from light to obscurity; that many others, by illumination upon them from foreign lands, have ascended from obscurity to light; and that many more, who were in darkness and who had no access to enlightenment from without, have continued unchanged and unchanging under gloom. The entire mass of civil history, in everything it exhibits respecting the civilizations of the world, has the same shapes, comprises the same materials, makes the same demonstrations as the historical views of civilization given in the Bible; and therefore it all indicates, as these views indicate, that the original condition of man was a civilized condition.

Ninthly, the history of each of the elements of civilization, like the history of aggregate civilization, or the history of all civilized nations, is entirely adverse to the theory of civilization being self-developed, and entirely conducive to the belief that civilization was a primal gift from God to man. The elements are too numerous to be noticed seriatim; but they can be distinctly seen as grouped into the three classes of religion, science, and art.

Now history nowhere says that true religion was anywhere self-developed. It says, on the contrary, that, under any people's own actings, the devout worship of the true God has always degenerated into corrupt worship of God's creatures; that, under any people's own actings, supreme personal monotheism has always degenerated into polytheism, pantheism, fetishism, or

Digitized by Google

some form of man-glorifying infidelity; that, under any people's own actings, false religion of any kind has never passed upward into true religion; that, under any people's own actings, even when they possessed much science and much art, idolatry or man-glorification has never passed upward into the worship of the true God; that, among any idolatrous people, otherwise than by influx of thought from a monotheistic people, idolatry has never given place to monotheism; that, among any people whatever, even among a monotheistic people, otherwise than by special propagation, no form of either false or defective religion has ever given place to Christianity; and that, in the grandest circumstances of any people, amid the blaze of the highest science, amid the very blaze of Christianity, a tendency to sink in religion is so strong, so persistent, so marvellous as to have dragged many noble minds down into the lowest depths of foul materialism. Who, then, will say that true religion, by far the greatest portion of genuine civilization, was ever self-developed? So obviously is it a gift from God to man, and so obviously a gift bestowed at the beginning, that the advocates of pristine savagism find their account in totally ignoring it.

History, again, nowhere says that true science ever was anywhere self-developed. It is largely quoted, indeed, and quoted in tones of triumph, as saying much about man's origination of science, and about the kinds and quantities of his scientific discoveries. But let it be read with discrimination, and it will be found to ascribe no true science essentially to mere man, far less to progressive advance in any conceivable intrinsic civilization. First, all false science must be swept from the record; and that forms the main bulk of what is quoted under

Digitized by Google

the name of science. Next, the effect of all the false science must be quoted ; and that, as in the case of the Chaldean astrology, and in the case of much of the Greek philosophy, will be seen to have done vastly more to deteriorate civilization than any amount of co-existent true science could possibly have done to maintain it. Next, the derivation of true thought or true knowledge either from previous enlightened peoples or from foreign sources of enlightenment, must be taken into account ; and that, in the case of any civilized nation, either ancient or modern, will leave a very small proportion of their true science to be assignable to any other origin. Next, the resuscitation or revival of any true science or good literature among a people whose ancestors had locked it up in books and forgotten it, must be duly considered ; and that, as in the case of what history well calls "the revival of letters" in Europe, will exhibit the phenomena of an era of civilization as the phenomena, not of an origination but of a resuscitation, or as all due to pre-existing enlightenments. And next, the vital, germinating, expansive character of true science must be borne in mind, as possessing a force which works like life, grows like a seed, and ramifies like a tree ; and that, when identified with the precurrent or communicated knowledge whence all genuine scientific discoveries have sprung, will appear the ample origin of all the remaining true science which the world has ever witnessed, and an origin ample enough for twenty times more. Such are the showings of history. They point out the main bulk of nominal science as false, and brand it as enormously mischievous ; they indicate the source, the essence, and many of the phases of true science to have been all above or beyond man, and

Digitized by Google

coming to him only by conveyance; and they exhibit the other or later phases of true science as due to its own essence, or as streams from its own source, or as like function from life or like flame from fire. The conclusion from the whole points unmistakably to pristine science, communicated by God to primeval man. And let that pristine science be set down at ever so limited an amount, being all pure, all exalted, all energetic, all in co-existence and co-operation with the true worship of the true God, it was a source sufficiently copious for unspeakably better and deeper streams of knowledge than any which have ever run along the civilized world. Had not puddles of false theory polluted its waters, marshes of false religion stagnated them, deserts of general degeneracy absorbed them, it would have done vastly more than send forth the few runnels which have distinguished the civilized nations from the savage ones, or than form the underground currents which have been reached by the borings of discoverers.

History, again, nowhere represents the arts as all invented by men, still less as invented by savages, still less as having gradually grown out of a course of progressive self-civilization. It does not, indeed, speak so amply about them as it does about religion and about science—for the obvious reasons that they are intrinsically far less important elements of civilization than religion and science are, that many of them are simple diversities or outgrowths of one another, and that most may be regarded as little or nothing else than concretes or practical applications of the knowledge contained in science; yet it speaks about them amply enough to dissever them all, manifestly and completely, from the theories of aboriginal savagism and self-conducting

Digitized by Google

progress. It places the most necessary ones exactly where these are placed by the traditions of ancient nations, far back in pristine times, when Divine communications were made to men, and when no records were yet written; and it exhibits the less useful, the more subordinate, or the simply luxurious ones, as appearing, disappearing, and re-appearing throughout the historical ages, very much in the manner of the flashes of a revolving light in a modern pharos. If only pure history, apart from tradition, be looked at, the commencement of it shows the most useful arts to be already all alight, and the progress of it shows the other arts in continual change, some dwindling from splendour into extinction, some corruscating from an old sphere into a new one, and some bursting afresh into flame from a long smouldering ember. Even art-culture, in its departments of taste and luxury, has appeared so much like a travelling light, passing from region to region, that many persons suppose it to be always moving in a circle; so that even this merely superficial, very unessential, and often corrupting element of civilization, has never behaved in the manner of self-development and continuous improvement. The most useful arts, too, such as cooking by fire, the working of metals, the cultivating of land, the depasturing of flocks, the domesticating of beasts of burden, the building of houses, and the fabricating of wearing apparel, always date back to the prehistoric times of the ancient civilized peoples, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Persians, the Greeks, and the Romans, and even appear in full play among the surrounding nations whom the proudest of these peoples currently styled "barbarians." Individual arts, no doubt, have been invented; but some of these were rather discovered

Digitized by Google

than invented, or were lost for a time and re-appeared, and all of them have been of kinds which might readily be deduced either from precurrent arts or from the principles of precurrent knowledge; insomuch that all, even though they were vastly more numerous and vastly more ingenious than they have ever been, cannot be pronounced more than a mere effluence from the original sources of civilization. Any art, as to the rationale of it, might be regarded as inventible by enlightened reason; and yet, so regarded, would be purely and entirely an emanation from communicated science. "I believe," says Archbishop Whately, "there is no art that man may not have invented, supposing him to have a certain degree of mental cultivation to start from. But as for any art, much less all the arts, being invented by savages, none of whom can be proved to have ever invented anything, that is quite a different question. The fallacy here employed, which is called in logical language 'the fallacy of composition,' consists in taking a term first in the divided sense, and then in the collective sense. This art and that and the other, &c., each taken separately, is not beyond the power of man to invent; all the arts are this and that and the other, &c., taken collectively; therefore, all may have been originally invented by unaided man. In like manner, there is no one angle and no one side of a triangle that may not be discovered, if we have certain data to start from. Given two sides and the contained angle, we can ascertain the remaining side and the other angles; or again, if we know one side and two angles, we can discover the rest. But it would be a new sort of trigonometry that could discover all the three angles and three sides without any data at all." Hence, the earliest arts in the world, whatever

Digitized by Google

they were, whether few or many, plain or exquisite, were the outcome, not of savagism, but of a divinely constituted civilized condition, or of a divinely communicated knowledge.

Tenthly, the history of each of the most remarkable of the civilized nations, both ancient and modern, is entirely adverse to the theory of civilization being self-developed or self-progressional, and entirely conducive to the belief that civilization was originally a gift from God to primeval man, and has always been dependent, directly or indirectly, on revelational teaching. A partial, contorted, or misrepresented history of the most remarkable civilized nations is currently paraded as the grand defence of the original savagism theory; but the full, straight, true history of them not only says nothing to support that theory, but says everything to destroy it. Even such writers as Volney, in the very title of his work on "the Ruins of Empires," Gibbon, in the very title of his work on "the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," and Draper, in the very drift of his work on "the Intellectual Development of Europe," are constrained to recognize great civilized nations, not as ever growing upward in an innate vitality of civilization, but as steadily decaying downward in a mortal disease of enfeeblement and dotage. And all other writers of the same anti-Biblical school as Volney, Gibbon, and Draper, if they took the same broad view of facts, would certainly adopt the same conclusion. The chief civilizations selected by any of them are those of the ancient Egyptians, the ancient Greeks and Romans, and the present Britons or Western Europeans; and all these, as exhibited in history, are dead against the theory of self-origination and progression.

Digitized by Google

The ancient Egyptians were very far from either working out or improving true religion. They were, as regards that paramount portion of civilization, a people grossly deteriorated as they come first into view, and a people deteriorating more and more as they pass along the ages. They start upon us, in their oldest monuments, as already idolaters; and they figure before us, in their succeeding monuments, as making rapid increase of both beastly creature-worship and loathsome vice. Not a word is said about them, therefore, or can be said, in favour of alleged progressional religious civilization. The best of their sciences and their arts alone are brought into argument. These are separated from the worst ones, separated from their own defects, separated from their own broad indications of decay, and roundly pronounced the product of a very long process of self-development. And as thus unfairly, untruly, disingenuously treated, with thorough begging of the very question about them which they are adduced to prove, they certainly look to be rather imposing evidence. They form a grand catalogue—astronomy, geometry, electricity, magnetism, mesmerism, steam-force, chemistry, literature, geography, navigation, commerce, agriculture, architecture, sculpture, painting, music, metallurgy, glass-blowing, distilling, brewing, spinning, weaving, dyeing, sewing, and various other things; they include the greatest and most durable extant monuments which were ever reared; and they constitute a perfectly consistent *tout-ensemble*, harmonious throughout, and all bearing the impress of one civilization. But where is the proof either that they were self-evolved or that they were progressive? Not a particle of such proof exists; and proof to the contrary abounds. Their oldest phase is the phase of highest

Digitized by Google

excellence; and all their subsequent phases are phases of ever-increasing deterioration. They stand pictured on their own monuments, or identified with these monuments, historically, clearly, copiously, as much as if they figured in complete written record; yet they show not a trace of infancy, of adolescence, of any precurrent growth whatever; but they burst full-formed into view in their monuments, exactly as Adam comes full-formed into view in the book of Genesis; or rather they make their first appearance in their very best condition, with deep and broad marks upon it that it was a condition of degeneracy from a previous far higher condition; and then they appear to go steadily downward, age after age, in continual decadence, to a concluding, dismal, degraded, helpless barbarism. No advocate of aboriginal savagism, or of self-developing and progressional civilization, can fairly look at them without being staggered and silenced. Even Renan, contemplating their oldest phase, is compelled to say, "When one thinks of this civilization of the fourth dynasty, which had no known infancy; that this art, of which there remain innumerable monuments, had no archaic period; that the Egypt of Cheops and Chêphren is superior, in a sense, to all which followed, *one is seized with dizziness.*" Yes, the deniers of the Bible, the deniers of what that book records God to have done for primeval man, are "*seized with dizziness.*" They dislike that book; they dislike its testimony on the subject of civilization, that God gave civilization, and that men corrupted it; they summon ancient Egypt, with its marvellous monuments, to speak against that testimony; they cajole and cross-examine ancient Egypt to extract utterances in their own favour; they find ancient Egypt strongly, entirely,

Digitized by Google

persistently corroborating the book of God's testimony; and they are "*seized with dizziness!*"

The ancient Greeks and Romans differed from the ancient Egyptians by making an ascent in civilization. But in what degree and by what means did they make the ascent? In religion they made no ascent whatever, but made a great descent. Their religion was coarser, more corrupt, more polytheistic, less civilized and less civilizing in every way than the religion of the nations that lived before them; and it became increasingly impure, increasingly degraded, increasingly unfit for every purpose of civilized life, in their successive generations. A few individuals, or some small companies of them, indeed, at intervals or in special circumstances, caught the blessing of some measure of a higher faith; but all these got that blessing, either directly or indirectly, from the Hebrew scriptures; and they also, on account of getting it, were scorned or persecuted by their fellow-countrymen. In science or philosophy, as science or philosophy is commonly understood, the Greeks made great additions to what had gone before; but they made them much more largely in what was bad or false than in what was good or true; and they made the bad or false additions chiefly or entirely out of their own degenerating speculations, but acquired all the good or true additions, directly or indirectly, either by transmission from the ancient revelations or through communication with the Hebrew people. If we duly consider what ample means they had for getting enlightenment from the books and institutions of the Hebrews, we shall wonder, not that many good things are found in their philosophy, but that so many vile things crept into it, so many gross things debased it, so many immoral,

Digitized by Google

heathenish, blaspheming things pervaded it. In arts too, and arts principally, the Greeks went far ahead of their immediate ancestors; but in these also they were little or nothing else than ready recipients or apt scholars. Their own traditions, as we have already seen, ascribe the origin of their fine arts to pristine supernal agency—the origin of their agriculture and other common arts to early importation from foreign lands; and their own authors and monuments, as compared with the ancient writers and the ancient monuments of other nations, distinctly prove their fine arts likewise to have been imported. The elements of their very literature were got from Phœnicia; and the characteristic features of their boasted architecture, Doric and Ionic, were got from Egypt and Assyria. They themselves, no doubt, made improvements on their art-models; but they made these improvements on art-models got out of civilizations which had degenerated from the pristine civilization; they made them under aid of the new enlightenment got from the Hebrew books and practices; they made them in an animus of moral declension, mainly toward ends of ambition, pride, and luxury; and they accompanied the making of them with such a progress in social vice as renders the full-drawn picture of their condition far more disgusting than agreeable. And as to the Romans, they did little more in civilization than take copies from the Greeks, and either improve some by additional borrowings from the Eastern peoples, or deface others by their own bad taste. Had either they or the Greeks received no other enlightenment than what came to them from their own heathen ancestors, they never could have emerged a hair's breadth from the darkness in which these ancestors lay. Divine revela-

Digitized by Google

tion, directly or indirectly, was to their civilization exactly what it has been to all other civilizations, the source of everything solid, beneficent, or true. They retained, at the best, especially in their ethics and eminently in their religion, a terrible amount of savagism; and had they rejected the offered or accessible light of Divine revelation as much in other matters as they rejected it in matters of ethics and religion, they would have been savages always and savages intensely. And then both Greeks and Romans, despite of the extrinsic light which they got, and despite of the considerably good use which they temporarily made of it, slid downward in a descent toward barbarism. And downward would they have continued to go into barbarism complete and final, had they not been met and stopped by the new influences of Christianity. Not in all the history of the Greeks and Romans, therefore, is there the vestige of anything to countenance the theory of self-developing or progressive civilization.

The present Western Europeans, especially the inhabitants of Great Britain, together with the offshoots from them in America and the colonies, are represented, by the advocates of aboriginal savagism, as the most highly civilized people that ever lived—as the topmost branch and most fruitful bough of the ever-growing tree of civilization—as the latest, broadest, deepest, richest reach of the river of all human excellence, whose wellhead was in the land of pristine barbarism, and whose waters have accumulated from thousands of tributaries along the course of all the ages. Strange that they should be so represented! Whatever place has the topshoot of a tree, has also the root of the tree; and whatever valley or basin has the latest reach of a river, has

Digitized by Google

also the river's source. But Western Europe was not the region of the primal or early peoples, out of whom all others grew; and therefore cannot be the source of any indigenous growth of civilization onward from the primal or the early times. South-western Asia, inclusive of Egypt, according to the showings of all the theorists themselves, was the region both of the early generations of mankind and of their grand ancient civilizations; and therefore ought, according to the theorists, to be the scene of the most umbrageous leafage and the most accumulated river-flow of true religion, science, and art; yet, for many ages, has been notoriously the reverse. Wherever, also, is the most fruitful bough of an ever-growing tree, there also must be only the kind of fruit which the tree natively bears, and that fruit in a state of high perfection. But Western Europe bears a magnificent species of civilization—the glorious fruit of true monotheism, of belief in the three-one God, of monotheism in Christianity—which was awanting among most of the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Persians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans; and it, at the same time, is laden with deadly fruit of many kinds, on boughs engrafted on it by hands violently hostile to all true civilization.

Let the present Western Europe be fairly viewed in whatever light we may, however seen in its most select portion, and however regarded in the sources of its civilization; let it even be taken as represented by Great Britain alone; and let it have full credit for all our accomplishments, our enterprise, our inventions, our discoveries, our blaze of science, and all other real or fancied excellences; and it will exhibit plenteous evidence that its civilization has been neither self-

Digitized by Google

originated, undecaying, nor progressive. How did it get Christianity and Christian ethics? and how has it maintained them? How much of its scientific knowledge has it got from the Bible? how much by inheritance from former students of the Bible? how much by importation from foreign lands? how much by borrowing from the ancients? What proportion of its arts, or of the principles on which they rest, from the commonest arts of life, through all the grades of manufactures, up to architecture, sculpture, painting, music, and poetry, has it got by mere tradition, rote-learning, copying, and imitating? How many excellent things of ancient religion and science does it either want altogether or possess only in very degenerate condition—such as the heavenly purity of the apostolic faith, the loving homeliness of the patriarchal practice, and the effective simplicity of the Hebrew social order, without standing army, police force, prison, or poorhouse? What amount of important ancient art has either not come down to it at all, or come down imperfectly and confusedly—such as the art of megalithic masonry, the art of inventive architecture, and the arts concerned in numerous lost inventions? And how prodigious are the sum, the variety, and the virulence of the antagonisms to civilization, the poisons to all excellence, the essences of all savagism, either engendered by itself or readily adopted and broadly maintained by it—such as corruptions of true religion, open infidelity, sleek hypocrisy, blaspheming science, false philosophy, political immorality, commercial swindling, empiricism, pauperism, and popular ignorance? Let answers to these questions be found; and, taking the present civilization of Great Britain as the highest civilization ever known to secular history, they will show

Digitized by Google

that civilized men, in any age, get all their genuine civilization from sources before or above them, and that they themselves have only and terribly corrupted it.

Lastly, eminent authors, writing without bias from any theory, and looking entirely to the aggregate testimony of secular history, pronounce civilization to have been aboriginal and neither self-developed nor progressive. Humboldt says: "The important question has not yet been resolved, whether that savage state, which even in America is found in various gradations, is to be looked upon as the dawning of a society about to rise, or whether it is not rather the fading remains of one sinking amidst storms, overthrown and shattered by overwhelming catastrophes. To me the latter seems to be nearer the truth than the former." Niebuhr expressed his full conviction that all savages are the degenerate remnants of civilized races, who had been overpowered by enemies, and driven to seek safety in woods and waste places, till they forgot most of the arts of settled life and sank into a wild state. Max Müller says, that as far as we can trace back the first life of man, even on the lowest strata of history, we see him to have possessed the Divine gift of a sound and sober intellect from the first, and that the idea of a humanity emerging slowly from the depths of an animal brutality can never be maintained again. Professor Rawlinson, through the long course of his elaborate researches, leads up to a similar conclusion. Dr. Daniel Wilson, in his work on "Prehistoric Man," contends for at least the germs of civilization in primeval man, and shows that American civilization, in the times before Columbus, made a very great descent. President Smith, in his "Essay on the Diversity of the Human Species," contends that savagism

Digitized by Google

cannot have been the state of the earliest generations, that to suppose it to have been so is contrary to sound reason and to all history, that savage tribes are tribes degenerated from more civilized ones, and that, if the first generation of men had been untaught by God, they could scarcely have found the means of sustaining life. "Hardly is it possible," says he, "that man, placed on the surface of the world, in the midst of its forests and marshes, capable of reason indeed, but without having formed principles to direct its exercise, should have been able to preserve his existence, unless he had received from his Creator, along with his being, some instructions concerning the employment of his faculties, for procuring his subsistence, and inventing the most necessary arts of life." And Archbishop Whately says: "According to the present course of things, the first introducer of civilization among savages is and must be man in a more improved state; in the beginning, therefore, of the human race, this, since there was no man to effect it, must have been the work of another being. There must have been, in short, something of a revelation made to the first or to some subsequent generation of our species. And this miracle (for such it clearly is, being out of the course of nature) is attested independently of Scripture, and consequently in confirmation of the Scripture accounts, by the fact that civilized man exists at the present day. Each one of us Europeans, whether Christian, deist, or atheist, is actually a portion of a standing monument of a former communication to mankind from some superhuman being. That man could not have made himself is often appealed to as a proof of the agency of a Divine creator; and that mankind could not, in the first instance, have civilized themselves,

Digitized by Google

is a proof of the same kind, and of precisely equal strength, of the agency of a Divine instructor."

Such, then, is an outline of proof, first from Scripture and next from reason and history, that civilization was aboriginal, or was a primal gift from God to man, and that, in its genuine character, it has anywhere or at any time existed exactly in the degree in which men have received the teachings of revelation. The outline might have been considerably extended; and details so numerous as to fill volumes could be added. Only as much has been said as, on the one hand, comported with our available limits, and as, on the other hand, might form a medium advocacy between the importance of the true view of civilization and the utter emptiness of the false. The importance of the true view is very great, involving no less than the verity of Scripture statement, the beneficence of God to man, the dependence of man on God, the weakness of unaided human reason, the deteriorating tendency of human thought and practice, the moral providence of God, and the intimate connexion or absolute identity of all human well-being with the influence of true religion, or of the things which truly civilize men in time with the things which save them for eternity; and that vast importance of the subject warranted and required all the extent of treatment which we have given it. But the utter emptiness of the opposite view deserved, on its own account, scarcely a sentence of notice. The advocates of aboriginal savagism or of self-developed and progressional civilization, deal only in flourishes and phantasms which challenge merely a few words of exposure and not one word of argument. They never once in the way of fact, and very rarely in the way even of thesis, treat the

Digitized by Google

question of civilization as a whole. They almost always treat of arts only, or at best of a mixture of arts and science; and they uniformly, even then, make no distinction between good and bad, draw no picture of the entire condition of a people, and use no pains to trace the good things to their real or obvious sources. Their notions, both as stated in form and as worked out in illustration, are as sheer assumption, as sheer theory, as if they were to say that all civilization grew out of cabbages or came down in dew from the moon. Their fancies about the early generations of men, as successively savages, hunters, flock-keepers, husbandmen, artisans, and manufacturers, and about their abodes, as successively caves, shielings, tents, cottages, and mansions, are as absolute fancies as the fancies of a dream; their pickings of a few isolated facts from the records of the speculations and the arts of a few of the ancient and modern nations, are no more an account of the civilizations of mankind than the etchings of one or two hamlets in the Fens would be a picture of all England and its cities; and not all of their fancies and their pickings taken together can cast a straw-breadth of even the most filmy shadow on the broad bright evidence, shining alike from the Bible and from secular history, that genuine civilization was originally a gift from God to primeval man, and that it has declined or increased, died or revived, anywhere in the course of ages, precisely as men have neglected or cherished, have lost or regained, the light of revelation.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VI.

MIRACLES.

Variety and conflict in definition of miracles. The Bible's account of them. They were very diversified. Various classes of them specified and illustrated. All were done directly by God. Lying wonders only were ever done by any creatures. All miracles were done in connexion with the reign of Christ, to unfold, attest, or enforce the truths of revelation. The several chief ones illustrated in that view. True miracles exhibited in a series of contrasts to counterfeits. Hume's argument against them examined. They were a necessity for man, and concurrent with revelation.

MIRACLE has been variously defined. Much or even most of the discussion of it has arisen from variety and conflict of definition. One writer on it has taken one line of argument, and another has taken a different line, solely on account of their viewing miracle in different lights. Even theological writers have differed widely from one another as to the mode or scope or object of miracles, as to the time when they ceased to be performed, or as to whether they have ceased at all, and as to the didactic import of some of the principal miracles, simply because they have differed from one another as to what miracle is. Some leading theological writers also have given a defective or wrong definition, to the great detriment of truth as sought to be expounded by

Digitized by Google

themselves, and to the still greater detriment of the cause of truth as impugned by the opponents of the Bible. Infidels have never been slow to seize erroneous definition, and to make the most of it against the claims of Christianity; and scientific impugners of what they call the supernatural have always accepted readily, for the purposes of their argument, any sort of definition which they could find incompatible with the facts of science. Many theologians, through means of erroneous definition, have played unwittingly into the hands of infidels and of opposing savants. Little care has been used by some leading defenders of miracles to see that they were rightly understood; and no care has been used by any assailants of them to see them otherwise than as defined by leading defenders. Enormous fallacy, on both sides, has prevailed from the use of the terms nature, course of nature, natural laws, established order, and uniform plan. The notions attached to these terms have differed or conflicted more than even the notion attached to the word miracle itself, and have added prodigiously to the confusion of the discussion. Advocates have understood natural laws in one sense; antagonists have understood them in another; and the two, while apparently arguing about the same thing, have really been arguing about different or even opposite things. Nature, course of nature, natural laws, and any similar terms, when employed in connexion with any such subject as that of miracles, are, as we showed in our first chapter, not only misleading in their use, but false in their essence. All persons ought to throw them aside, to avoid them carefully, and to go at once to the Bible for its own account of what miracles are. To overthrow a theologian who starts with a dim or defec-

Digitized by Google

tive or erroneous definition of a miracle, who works out the best parts of his argument on the ground of that definition, and who fractures even these parts with blows from the dark about natural laws—to overthrow such a man is nothing. The Bible is touched no more by that than by the exploding of the vagary of transubstantiation. Neither defenders of miracles can defend them rightly, nor opposers of them oppose them fairly, nor honest students of them study them with proper advantage, except in the light of the Bible's own description of what they are. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." [1]

The Bible says, respecting the ministry of the apostles, "God bore them witness both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will." [2] The signs, the wonders, the miracles, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost here are all included in the discussion of miracles. All the four terms seem to designate, generically or comprehensively, the same kinds of acts or similar ones; and appear to have differences of meaning, not so much with reference to any differences in the acts themselves, as with reference to differences in the aspects which these present and the purposes which they serve. The term "signs" [3] is used elsewhere to designate the conflicts of nations, the famines, the pestilences, the earthquakes, and the struggles and triumph of the gospel prior to the second coming of Christ; [4] the celestial accompaniments of Christ's second coming; [5] the infant Christ wrapped in swaddling clothes and lying in a manger; [6] the preserva-

[1] Isa. viii. 20.
[2] Heb. ii. 4.
[3] σημεῖα.
[4] Matt. xxiv. 3–14.
[5] Matt. xxiv. 30.
[6] Luke ii. 12.

Digitized by Google

tion of Jonah in the great fish's belly, and the entombment and resurrection of Christ;[1] the apocalyptic woman and the apocalyptic dragon;[2] the apocalyptic seven angels with the seven last plagues;[3] the gift of tongues;[4] the acts of exorcising, of speaking in new tongues, and of healing the sick, which attested the ministry of the first preachers of the gospel;[5] the miracles of the day of Pentecost;[6] the miracles immediately after the day of Pentecost;[7] the miracles done by Christ in the course of His ministry;[8] the miracles done in the times of the apostles by God's hand in the name of Christ;[9] the miracles done in connexion with the ministry of the apostles and their fellow-labourers;[10] and the miracles done by God, for the benefit of the Israelites, in Egypt, and in the Red Sea, and in the wilderness.[11] The term "wonders"[12] is used along with the term "signs" in the last six of these instances, to designate the same thing. The term "miracles," or powers,[13] is used to designate the meaning or force of language;[14] the force of the apostles' testimony to the resurrection of Christ;[15] the moral power of the gospel;[16] power among creatures under the reign of Christ;[17] the miracles done by Christ in the course of His ministry;[18] the miracles done in evidence of the apostleship of Paul;[19] the gifts or power bestowed on the apostles at Pentecost;[20] the miracles done through endowed men by agency of the Holy Spirit;[21] and omni-

[1] Matt. xii. 38, 40; xvi. 4. [2] Rev. xii. 1, 3. [3] Rev. xv. 1.
[4] 1 Cor. xiv. 22. [5] Mark. xvi. 17–20. [6] Acts ii. 19. [7] Acts ii. 43.
[8] John iv. 48; Acts ii. 22; John ii. 11, 23; iii. 2; vi. 26; vii. 31; xi. 47; xii. 37. [9] Acts iv. 30.
[10] Acts v. 12; vi. 8; xiv. 3; xv. 12; Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12.
[11] Acts vii. 36. [12] *τέρατα.* [13] *δυνάμεις.* [14] 1 Cor. xiv. 4.
[15] Acts iv. 33. [16] Rom. i. 16. [17] Eph. i. 21.
[18] Matt. xi. 20, 21, 23; Matt. xiii. 54; Acts ii. 22.
[19] 2 Cor. xii. 12. [20] Luke xxiv. 49. [21] 1 Cor. xii. 10.

Digitized by Google

potence or Deity.[1] The phrase, "gifts of the Holy Ghost" is explained in 1 Cor. xii. 7–11: "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another diverse kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues. But all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." The four terms thus appear to be considerably interchangeable, and to designate miracles collectively; while each of them, of course, has a separate meaning of its own. The word "signs" seems to designate miracles with reference to the extraordinary intimations they made of the Divine will; the word "wonders," with reference to their intrinsic stupendousness or magnificence; the word "miracles" or powers, with reference to the omnipotence or Divine agency which worked them; and the phrase "gifts of the Holy Spirit," with reference to their subordination to the offices or operations of the Holy Spirit in the scheme of redemption.

Three things are distinctly apparent from this collocation of passages. One of these is, that miracles were very various, varying from acts resembling acts of providence to acts resembling acts of creation, and from physical to mental and moral; another is, that they were done directly by God—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and the third is, that they were done in connexion with the reign of Christ, to unfold, attest, or enforce the truths of revelation. The same three

[1] Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62.

Digitized by Google

things, as we shall afterwards see, are apparent from the details of numerous individual miracles given in the New Testament, and from both the general statements respecting miracles and the narratives of individual ones in the Old Testament. All the three things require to be kept fully in mind and to be viewed conjointly, in order to a correct understanding of what a miracle is. Any discussion which starts with incomplete recognition of them, which leaves one of them, or even part of one of them, out of consideration, is wrong at the outset, and goes straight onward to a wrong conclusion. A man who writes about stupendous acts, remarkable only for their stupendousness; or a man who writes about stupendous acts essentially or totally different from great acts of providence and from acts of creation; or a man who writes about stupendous acts done by God without specific purpose relating to the revelation of His will; or a man who writes about stupendous acts done by other agency than God's; or a man who writes about stupendous acts of any kind unconnected with the Holy Spirit's work in the scheme of redemption; or a man who writes about stupendous acts otherwise than as acts of various kinds, all done by God only, and all done in the evolution of the mediatorial reign of Christ; writes about merely a misconception, and does not write about miracles at all. Neither a sound exposition of miracles can be given, nor an intelligent objection to them raised, nor an effective defence of them made, nor a fully instructive view of them obtained, except on the ground of the Bible's own account of what they were.

Miracles, then, were very various. The New Testament, as we have seen, includes in them all which were done by our Lord, His incarnation, His resurrection, all

Digitized by Google

which were done by the Holy Spirit, all which were done in connexion with the ministry of the apostles and of their fellow-labourers, and all which were done on behalf of the Israelites in Egypt, at the Red Sea, and in the wilderness. The Old Testament also includes all which were done for the Israelites in Egypt, at the Red Sea, and in the wilderness ;[1] it includes also the passage of the Jordan ;[2] and, either in general statements[3] or by implication in the several narratives, it includes likewise all which were done, at subsequent periods, among the people of the Hebrew commonwealth. The miracles ranged, in kind, from acts resembling acts of providence to acts resembling acts of creation, and from acts of mainly a physical character to acts mainly, or even wholly, mental or moral. We noticed, in our chapter on the Supernatural, a number of miracles of the several kinds ; and we showed there that all these miracles were done in perfect accordance with the forces which are misnamed "the laws of nature." The only really specious objection against miracles rests entirely on these forces. It is not an objection against them in their entirety, not against them as they are described in the Bible, not against them in their attestings of Divine truth or in their connexions with the economy of redemption, not, therefore, properly against miracles at all ; nor does it even take into account, in any way, their moral teachings, or so much as include among them those which were mental or moral ; but it regards them altogether in their physical aspect, and impugns them solely on the ground

[1] Exod. iii. 20 ; iv. 21 ; vii. 3 ; xi. 9, 10 ; Numb. xiv. 22 ; Deut. iv. 34 ; vi. 22 ; vii. 19 ; xi. 3 ; xxvi. 8 ; xxix. 2, 3 ; xxxiv. 11 ; Judges vi. 13 ; Neh. ix. 10 ; Psa. lxxviii. 11–16 ; lxxviii. 42–53 ; cv. 27 ; cxxxv. 9 ; Jer. xxxii. 20, 21.

[2] Josh. iii. 5.

[3] 1 Chron. xvi. 12 ; Psa. lxxvii. 11–14 ; cv. 5 ; Dan. vi. 27.

Digitized by Google

of their alleged incompatibility with "natural laws." Hence, on the one hand, it is entitled to no consideration, on account of its not viewing them as they really were—on account especially of its leaving out of sight their most important aspects; and, on the other hand, it makes a specious show, takes on an appearance of vigour, moves dashingly in its argument, by its assuming to have no more to do than to prove that "natural laws" are uniform and permanent. That is its whole case. It does not actually touch, or even aim at, one point in the doctrine of miracles; it deals entirely with the "natural laws;" and it makes impression on any persons, or possesses any hold on the minds of the very persons who urge it, only through means of the delusion that the fact of a miracle and the fact of the "natural laws" do not mutually comport. It is an objection not against miracle only, but against providence, against revelation, against special creation; it stands and argues wholly on the platform of a misconception as to how the "natural laws" work, particularly as to their abundant susceptibility of adjustment and combination toward new ends; and, when that misconception is exploded and the platform falls, as we saw the misconception to be exploded and the platform to fall in our chapter on the Supernatural, the objection is nowhere.

Friends as well as foes have done much harm here. Friends may even be said, in some sense, to have done all the harm. Their wrong definitions and mistaken reasonings have furnished the materials for the foes to fight with. Many of them have talked of miracles principally as stupendous acts. What a thing for theologians to do! That has long been the arrow which the enemy has shot. Many of them have also said, and

Digitized by Google

even contended, that miracles were suspensions of the laws of nature, or deviations from them. What a still worse thing for them to do! first to talk of the laws of nature, and then to talk of them as suspended! That has long been the barb in the enemy's arrow. These friends do not see acts of providence as, in any sense, suspensions of "the laws of nature," or deviations from them; nor do they see an act of creation to have been, in any manner, inharmonious with "laws." Let them simply look at miracles in their various kinds, as exhibited in the Bible, and they will see them to have been in the same category as providence and creation.

Some miracles, such as those of the locusts and the hail in Egypt, differed nothing from great acts of providence, except in the speciality and breadth of their moral teaching. They did not differ even in what has sometimes but erroneously been regarded as a characteristic of miracle, uniqueness of occurrence or non-repetition. Events precisely similar to them have often occurred as providential acts. Some other events, too, such as the deluge of Noah, and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, which all theologians justly regard as great acts of providence, and which some are disposed to regard even as miracles, are viewed by the very infidel savants, who reject all ideas of providence, as having been simply products of what *they* call natural laws. These savants rank them with numerous floods which occurred before the time of Adam, and with very numerous volcanic upbursts both before and since. But let the two miracles of the locusts and the hail be seen in their proper light, as acts immensely beyond the power of any creatures to do, and as acts done by God in connexion with the revelation of His truth and the

Digitized by Google

evolving and establishing of His covenant of redemption; and then they appear with a character stupendously above that of any mere physical phenomena. And let theologians accept them as truly two of the miracles of the Bible—as two of "the signs and wonders in the land of Ham;"[1] let them consider the physical phenomena of them, apart from their special doctrinal import, as phenomena precisely identical with those of many acts of providence; let them also take into account the unbelieving savants' notions of Noah's flood and the overthrow of Sodom; and they will surely have done with all talk about suspension of the laws of nature.

Some other miracles differed physically from great physical acts of providence mainly or solely in displaying a higher exercise of the Divine perfections. Those of the frogs, the lice, the flies, and the murrain in Egypt, resembled other plagues which have occurred in Divine judgments, and were physically different from them only in intensity.[2] Those of the passage of the Red Sea and of the supply of quails in the wilderness so far resembled ordinary acts of providence as to have been done partly by means of winds.[3] That of the bringing of the water from the rock, pointed out by God to Moses, for the supply of the Israelites in the wilderness, may have been a miracle mainly in previsive preparation of the strata and in omniscient direction to the spot for striking them, and may, as to the obtaining of the water, have done no more than is done by the boring of an artesian well.[4] That of the passage of the Jordan, as to all the physique of it, may have been simply a line of transient upheaval across the river's bed, differing nothing in character from

[1] Psa. cv. 27–35.
[2] Exod. viii. 1–32, ix. 1–7.
[3] Exod. xiv. 21; Num. xi. 31.
[4] Num. xx. 7–11.

Digitized by Google

many volcanic actions which have made transient islets in the ocean or transient hillocks in the land.[1] That of the sun standing still upon Gibeon and the moon in the valley of Ajalon, however the passage recording it may be read or interpreted, seems, as to the physical phenomena of it, to have comprised no more than either unusual atmospheric refractions of light or special points of view from which the luminaries were seen.[2] That of the destruction of Sennacherib's army, in its encampment against Jerusalem, may have physically been the action of a simoom, differing from other simooms only in breadth and intensity.[3] And that of our Lord's rebuking the storm in the sea of Galilee, with the effect of producing a great calm, seems to have differed nothing from God's ordinary "stilling of the noise of the seas" except in unusual strength and suddenness.[4] All these, of course, as truly as the last, were done by God; all were immensely beyond the power of any creature to do; all manifested Divine perfections; and all were done in circumstances to convey exalted special moral teaching; but they neither suspended any of the forces miscalled laws of nature, nor deviated from them; they simply controlled them.

Some other miracles were characterized by some special manner of manifesting the Divine power. One instance of these was the consuming of Elijah's sacrifice on Carmel. The fire of the Lord there, or the lightning, was poured down in such quantity, and directed to one point so steadily, as to consume the sacrifice and the wood, in spite of the large volume of water around them, and to evaporate the water itself and dissipate the stones

[1] Josh. iii. 5–17. [2] Josh. x. 12, 13. [3] 2 Kings xix. 35.
[4] Matt. viii. 26; Mark iv. 39; Luke viii. 24.

Digitized by Google

and the dust.[1] But no interference was made with any law or force of either the lightning itself, the wood, the water, the stones, or anything else. Another instance was our Lord's walking on the sea of Galilee, and preventing Peter from sinking in the water.[2] He, there, by His Divine power, upheld both His own body and that of Peter on the sea's surface; but He did not suspend or alter any law or force either of the bodies or of the water. He always "hangs the earth upon nothing,"[3] and "upholds all things by the word of His power,"[4] and He simply did a similar thing when He upheld the bodies on the sea. Other instances were our Lord's giving sight to the blind, giving hearing to the deaf, restoring the lame and the palsied to strength, and healing all manner of diseases.[5] He effected cures instantaneously and perfectly; but He effected them simply by His Divine power; He made no interference with any law or force of either the body or the mind of the subjects, or of any of their organisms, or of any matter around them or on them. He merely operated without any medical means; He did the cures by the direct or immediate exercise of His power. When any similar cures are done by men, through medical appliances, the results, except for being slow and imperfect, are essentially the same. A slow medical cure carries a patient through a transition stage, between disease and health, with phenomena or plays of force peculiar to itself; a quick medical cure shortens that stage, and correspondingly shortens the intermediate plays of force; and a miraculous cure by Christ simply overleaped that stage, and gave no space for the intermediate plays of

[1] 1 Kings xviii. 30–39. [2] Matt. xiv. 25—33. [3] Job xxvi. 7.
[4] Heb. i. 3. [5] Matt. iv. 23, 24, xi. 4, 5, xv. 30, 31; Luke vii. 22.

Digitized by Google

force. His miracle carried the patient at once from the conditions or forces of disease to the conditions or forces of health; but it did not suspend or alter any one of either class of forces; it simply left out the forces which play through the process of a medical cure; and it evinced itself to be a miracle, or a manifestation of Divine power, by the very fact of leaving them out. What else was meant by our Lord's applying a mixture of saliva and clay to the eyes of one blind man when restoring his sight?[1] The onlookers were to see there that no medical means were employed, that an application was made which obviously could possess no medical virtue, that a cure was to be done solely and directly by Divine power; but they saw clearly, both in that case and in every other, that the conditions of the subject, immediately before and immediately after the cure, were exactly the conditions of respectively ordinary disease and ordinary health. Other instances were the raising of the dead to life.[2] The main difference between these and the preceding is their want of any analogue on the part of men—the non-existence of any medical process, or of any human process of any kind, for restoring a dead person to life; and that difference has, very strangely, been adduced by some theologians in support of their erroneous definition of a miracle, as "a suspension of the laws of nature." A raising from death to life, they exclaim, was never done by natural law! It certainly was never done by created power; but neither was the making of a plant, the making of an animal, or the making of a man. Yet God made the first pairs of all plants, the first pairs of all animals, and the first pair of

[1] John ix. 6, 7.

[2] 2 Kings iv. 32–37; Luke vii. 11–16; John xi. 11–45; Acts ix. 36–42.

Digitized by Google

the human race, all in strict accordance with what is called natural law; and why could He not also raise dead persons to life in strict accordance with it? All the ordinary conditions of a dead person before the miracle, of a living person after it, and of every attendant thing at the moment of it, were in full existence at a raising from death to life. The Divine act was simply an act of power, giving life again as it gave life at first; and it neither suspended, set aside, nor interfered with any law or force. If you say it did, you must say so too about an act of creating.

Some other miracles manifested the Divine power in a manner similar to that in special creations; but differed from these in producing, not organic beings, but organic substances; and, at the same time, were of such a character that their harmony with the forces termed natural laws can be readily discernible through the science of chemistry. Such were the changing of the waters of Egypt into blood,[1] the giving of manna to the Israelites in the wilderness,[2] our Lord's converting of water into wine at Cana of Galilee,[3] and his twice prodigiously augmenting loaves and fishes for feeding multitudes of persons;[4] and these have been noticed, with some comment, in our chapter on the Supernatural. The miracle of making a piece of iron to float, at Elisha's school of the prophets,[5] had so far a resemblance to these that some comprehension of its accordance with the forces miscalled natural laws is obtained through acquaintance with chemical action; and that also has

[1] Exod. vii. 19-25.
[2] Exod. xvi. 4-36; Num. xi. 7-9; Deut. viii. 3, 16; John vi. 31-38.
[3] John ii. 1-11.
[4] Matt. xiv. 15-21, xv. 32-38; Mark vi. 35-44; viii. 1-9, Luke ix. 10-17; John vi. 5-14.
[5] 2 Kings vi. 1-7.

Digitized by Google

been noticed in our chapter on the Supernatural. The augmenting of the widow of Zarephath's barrel of meal and cruse of oil, or the preserving of them from diminution,[1] appears to have been of the same kind as our Lord's augmenting of the loaves and fishes. The case of "death in the pot," in Elisha's school of the prophets at Gilgal, presents a resemblance to the cases which are appreciable through knowledge of chemical action; yet probably was not a miracle at all, but only an act of special providence.[2] Neither "the meal" nor "the wild gourd" in it has been well ascertained; but, whatever they were, the one looks to have been an antidote to the other. The event, therefore, may have been no more than the providential guiding of Elisha to the prompt use of a substance which was providentially at hand.

Some other miracles resembled those of the raising of the dead to life, but had other and very different features. The resurrection of the "many saints who came out of the graves after the resurrection of Christ, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many,"[3] may be presumed to have been, in all essential respects, the same as will be the resurrection of the righteous at the last day.[4] Prophecies had been written, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise,"[5] "I will ransom them from the power of the grave, I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction;"[6] and now these prophecies were fulfilled. That miracle was more than a raising from death to life; it involved the reconstruction of the body from its dissolved and

[1] 1 Kings xvii. 8-16. [2] 2 Kings iv. 38-41. [3] Matt. xxvii. 52, 53.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 35-54. [5] Isa. xxv. 19. [6] Hos. xiii. 14.

Digitized by Google

scattered elements; it involved also the transmutation of the body from a corruptible, dishonoured, weak, and psychical condition to an incorruptible, glorious, powerful, and spiritual condition; and it could not be said, even less than any miracle of simply restoring life, to present any sort of resemblance to any sort of deed possible to created power. Men who misrepresent a raising from the dead as inaccordant with what they call natural law, might much more misrepresent both this resurrection and the resurrection at the last day, as unaccordant with it. They might allege the transmutation of the body, from mortal to immortal, from psychical to spiritual, as even more against "natural law" than the re-inspiring of it with life; and might flourishingly ask, "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" The Bible itself answers them: "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body."[1] If organic reproduction, thus so beautifully and strikingly adduced, were no more than mere analogy, it would strongly rebuke the talkers about suspension of the physical forces or about deviation from them. But, while presenting analogy, it also presents apposite fact. The very advocates of origination of organic beings by sheer evolution of sheer physical forces, seize on the phenomena of reproduction, and on the phenomena concurrent with it, for vindication of their pangenesis, their heterogenesis, and their other extreme theories.

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 35-38,

Digitized by Google

These phenomena are almost inconceivably subtle; they show decompositions of conjoined compound substances into invisible elements, precurrently to formation of the same substances in multiplied abundance; they also show, especially in many animals, first, apparent annihilation of the entire being, next, observable transformation from an initial infinitesimal germ, through a long series of increments and manifold changes, onward to a perfect complex organization; they also show, in some species, a gradation of organizations, from one kind into another and another; they likewise show, occasionally, the assumption of new or variation properties or characters, with capacity to retain and transmit these under new conditions; and they, therefore, furnish facts, many and patent, for establishing the identity of two kinds of bodies quite as manifestly different from each other as the psychical body of man in the present life from the spiritual body of Christians at the resurrection. The resurrection of the saints at Jerusalem, therefore, was no more a deviation from "natural law" than reproduction is. Yet in its own character it differed entirely. It was instantaneous; it was a reconstruction from elements which had long been decomposed and scattered; it was a glorification of the bodies; it was a reuniting of these to the souls which had long been separated; it was a direct result of the atonement of Christ; it transpired concurrently with the completion of the atonement, and in fulfilment of prophecy; in one word, it was a miracle.

The translation of Enoch and Elijah [1] was essentially the same as a glorious resurrection. It did not reconstruct a dead body, but it suddenly transformed and

[1] Gen. v. 24; Heb. xi. 5; 2 Kings ii. 1–11.

Digitized by Google

glorified a living one, and conveyed it to heaven. Its chief feature was the instantaneity of the transformation; and that showed the working of omnipotence, but did not, any more than our Lord's healing of diseases, imply any interference with the physical forces of the body. The old body, on the contrary, acted as it had ever done up to the moment of the miracle; and the new body, accordantly with the properties belonging to it, passed up to heaven. The miracle was the same as shall take place on all living Christians at the last day. "We who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not go before those who are asleep; for the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we also who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." [1]

The resurrection of Christ was unique. It might seem, to careless thinkers, to have resembled the raising of Lazarus; or it might seem, to graver thinkers, from its including the glorification of the body, to have resembled also the resurrection of the saints and the translation of Enoch and Elijah; but it was immensely more and immensely different. It was God's act, for completing the covenant of redemption, and manifesting His complacency in Christ's work of atonement.[2] It was Christ's own act, for evincing His Deity and proving His Messiahship.[3] It was both the result and the evidence of His having taken away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, of His having expiated all the guilt of mankind

[1] 1 Thess. iv. 15–17. [2] Acts ii. 23–36.
[3] Rom. i. 4; John x. 17, 18, ii. 18–22.

Digitized by Google

which had been laid upon Him, and of His having brought in everlasting righteousness.[1] It was the basis both of His people's justification from all guilt, and of His own going up to heaven to intercede on their behalf.[2] It was the extraction of the sting of death, the overthrow of the victory of the grave, in reference to all redeemed men, and at once the pledge, the prelude, and the platform of the eventual general resurrection of the just.[3] It evinced Christ Himself to be "the resurrection and the life;"[4] gave assurance that He will raise up every one of His people at the last day;[5] and is the ground for His saying from His throne in the heavens, "I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of the invisible world and of death."[6] It entered at once and always into the preaching of the apostles, as not less a great doctrine than a great fact;[7] and it formed the very keystone of the arch of practical truth which they exhibited. "If Christ be not risen," said Paul, "then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God that He raised up Christ, whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins; then they also who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept."[8] "Yea doubtless, I count all things but

[1] Isa. liii. 4–12; Rom. vi. 3–10.
[2] Rom. iv. 25, viii. 33, 34; Eph. ii. 4–7; 1 Peter i. 3, iii. 21, 22.
[3] 1 Cor. xv. 20–22, 51–57. [4] John xi. 25. [5] John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54
[6] Rev. i. 18. [7] Acts i. 22, iv. 2, 33, xvii. 18. [8] 1 Cor. xv. 14–20.

Digitized by Google

dung that I may win Christ, and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith, that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."[1] Thus the resurrection of Christ, by the vastness of its doctrinal import, was a miracle very grandly and extensively moral. And who will say, as to either its physical or its moral character, that it was any deviation from the forces in the world? It lay within the very source of these forces; it took place as a stupendous adjustment of them all; it was a central event of that mediatorial reign which encompasses and penetrates and controls them all.

Other and numerous miracles were entirely mental or moral. All miracles whatever, in connexion with the purposes they served in the economy of revelation and redemption, were in some degree, or even largely or mainly, moral. But the numerous miracles to which we now refer were wholly so; and they, like the physical ones, were of widely various kinds. Two great series of them, the one in our Lord's enchaining the passions of hostile multitudes, the other in the Holy Spirit's regenerating of wicked men, have been noticed, with some comment, in our chapter on the Supernatural. Others were all the kinds called "gifts of the Holy Ghost;" and these were not single acts, but prolonged endowments. Two of them, "the gifts of healing" and the "working of miracles,"[2] might seem to have at least

[1] Phil. iii. 8–11.

[2] *χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων . . . ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων* (1 Cor. xii. 9, 10).

Digitized by Google

had physical manifestations; but they, as well as the others, ranked as "gifts;" they had their seat in the mind; they were distinct from "the healing" and "the miracles" with which the possession of them was connected; and they seem to have consisted in specialized capacity or endowed intelligence to receive and communicate from God announcements as to any healing or miracles he was to do. Another was the gift of tongues, or the power of speaking new or previously unknown languages; and this was largely given, with miraculous manifestation, on the day of Pentecost,[1] and served afterwards "for a sign" to non-believers of the gospel.[2] Another was "interpretation of tongues;" and that appears to have been correlated to the preceding.[3] Another was prophecy or prophesying; and that was for the edifying of believers,[4] comprised a receiving of revelations,[5] and probably was concerned little or not at all with new predictions, but mainly or wholly with infallible exposition of the predictions already on record. Others were the word of wisdom, the word of knowledge, and faith or doctrine; and these seem to have been concerned with the infallible exposition of the preceptive, hortatory, and didactic portions of revealed truth. And all were in strict accordance with the ordinary forces or workings of the human mind. They were, indeed, "gifts of the Holy Ghost;" they were imparted and maintained miraculously by the Holy Spirit; they dealt with communications miraculously given by the Holy Spirit; and they closely resembled the gift or capacity of inspiration on the part of the holy men of God, in old time, "who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;"[6] but

[1] Acts ii. 1–21. [2] 1 Cor. xiv. 22. [3] 1 Cor. xiv. 27, 28.
[4] 1 Cor. xiv. 4, 22. [5] 1 Cor. xiv. 25–32. [6] 2 Pet. i. 21

Digitized by Google

they made no interference with the structure, functions, or forces of the intellect. A possessor of the gift of tongues, for example, collated words and formed sentences exactly like any other man; and in speaking any foreign language, differed from a native only in having got his knowledge of it not slowly but at once, and not by his own labour but by an act of God; or he both thought in words and put them together exactly as Adam did from the day he was created. If any man say that the miraculous gift of tongues was a deviation from the "laws of nature," he must say also that Adam's use of speech was a deviation from them. So likewise as to all the other gifts of the Holy Ghost. The thoughts with which they were concerned, as well as the gifts themselves, were miraculously given; but they, nevertheless, were both apprehended by the gifted persons themselves, and spoken forth to be apprehended by others in exactly the same manner, or according to the same "laws" of intellect, as any ordinary thoughts.

We come now to note that all miracles were done directly by God. No power to do any of them was ever possessed by a creature. The power which did them all was omnipotence, and could not be communicated to any finite being. The occasions on which they were done, and the special purposes which they severally served, also had intimate connexion with the entire scheme of revelation and redemption, and could not be determined by any intelligence less than omniscient and infinitely wise. Any of them which were done through the medium of creatures were not done by them, and were done through them only, as prophecy was done through them, by Divine intimation to their mind of what God designed to do. A man's being used in the

Digitized by Google

working of a miracle, and a man's being used in the uttering or writing of a prophecy, differed only in this, that the event in the former case was at hand, and in the latter case was distant. All the miracles done by Christ were done by Christ directly. All the gifts of the Holy Spirit were given and maintained by the Holy Spirit directly. Many of the other miracles, and sometimes all miracles collectively, are stated to have been done by God, without reference to any medium. Any miracles recorded to have been done through a medium are either expressly or impliedly recorded to have been done by God. The miracles done through the medium of Moses and Aaron, for example, were pre-announced to them by God, were no otherwise connected with Moses and Aaron than in their making the signals respecting them which God instructed them to make, and are expressly recorded again and again and always to have been done by God Himself.[1] The prayer of Peter and John in reference to all the miracles they expected to be done through the medium of the apostles and their fellow-labourers was, "Now, Lord, grant unto Thy servants that with all boldness they may speak Thy word, by stretching forth Thine hand to heal, and that signs and wonders may be done by the name of Thy holy child Jesus."[2] The narrative which Paul and Barnabas gave to the great assembly of apostles, elders, and brethren at Jerusalem, respecting the miracles which had been done in the course of their evangelizing journeys, was a narrative "declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them."[3]

[1] Exod. vii.–xiv.; Num. xiv. 22; Deut. vi. 22, xi. 3, xxvi. 8; Psa. lxxviii. 11–16, cv. 27, cxxxv. 8–12; Acts vii. 36.
[2] Acts iv. 29, 30. [3] Acts xv. 12.

Digitized by Google

And Paul, writing to the Romans, said, "I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God, so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ."[1]

Any objects used in the announcing or the working of miracles were mere implements of announcements or mere emblems of faith, nothing more. The rod used by Moses and Aaron was nothing better than any other rod, had no virtue in itself, and acquired none when or after the miracles were worked. It became sacred, indeed; but it became so, like the furnishings of the tabernacle, or like the tabernacle itself, simply by being set apart. The "handkerchiefs or aprons," also, which were brought from the body of Paul to the sick, with the result that "the diseases departed from them and the evil spirits went out of them,"[2] were mere symbols of the sick's belief in the power and willingness of God to heal them; were used, exactly as the rod of Moses and Aaron was used, to indicate a Divine communication; were employed for bed-ridden persons in their sick-rooms, as the rod of Moses and Aaron was employed for observers in the open air; and neither possessed nor acquired any virtue within themselves. Hence does the narrative concerning them say, "God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul, so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons."[3] Nor is the phrase "the hands of Paul" to be understood as implying that any of the power of the miracles was lodged in Paul himself; for it is explained, both by the

[1] Rom. xv. 18, 19. [2] Acts xix. 12. [3] Acts xix. 11, 12.

Digitized by Google

statement here that "God wrought the miracles," and by the statements of Paul and the other apostles previously quoted, that all the miracles in their ministry were done by God, to mean only that Paul was the medium of announcement, and was so for the attestation and enforcement of the doctrines which he preached. We, accordingly, read about him and Barnabas, "Long time abode they speaking boldly in the Lord, who gave testimony unto the word of His grace, and granted signs and wonders to be done by their hands."[1] A parallel to the case of the handkerchiefs or aprons, also, is seen in the case of the hem of our Lord's garment. "When the men of Gennesaret had knowledge of Him, they sent out into all that country round about, and brought unto Him all that were diseased, and besought Him that they might only touch the hem of His garment; and as many as touched were made perfectly whole."[2] Why did these persons touch the hem of His garment? and why were they healed when they touched it? Another instance explains why. "Behold, a woman, who was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years, came behind Him and touched the hem of His garment; for she said within herself, If I may but touch His garment, I shall be whole. But Jesus turned Him about, and when He saw her, He said, Daughter, be of good comfort, thy faith hath made thee whole; and the woman was made whole from that hour."[3] The touching of Christ's garment was simply an expression of faith in Christ Himself. The garment was no more in these miracles than the rod was in the miracles in Egypt. A sick person who sought to touch Christ's garment simply sought to be healed by Christ Himself; and a sick

[1] Acts xiv. 3. [2] Matt. xiv. 35, 36. [3] Matt. ix. 20–22.

Digitized by Google

person who sought to have a handkerchief or apron from the body of Paul simply sought to be healed by the God and Saviour whom Paul preached. No greater folly was ever done than to ascribe virtue of any kind, especially miraculous or spiritual virtue, to the clothes or bones or other relics of holy persons. A similar folly was done by the Israelites toward the brazen serpent; and, if it could possibly have been vindicated by any sort of argument, might have been said to be somewhat excusable. The brazen serpent was made and set up by Divine appointment; was employed as a symbol of faith in God, for miraculous cure of deadly bites by fiery serpents; and might have been seen, by all spiritually enlightened persons, as a type of the Redeemer lifted up, in the fulness of time, for the salvation of the world.[1] But the Israelites of subsequent generations forgot its true character, ascribed virtue to itself, burned incense to it, and thus committed folly and sin. "Hezekiah did that which was right in the sight of the Lord; he removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehushtan."[2] He called it Nehushtan, "a piece of brass." It was a piece of brass, nothing more; and a saint's napkin is a napkin, nothing more; a saint's bone is a bone, nothing more; a reputed "holy relic" of any kind is a piece of virtueless matter, nothing more.

Any men or other creatures said in the Bible to have worked miracles may be seen, either by the mode of expression or by a comparing of context and parallel passages, to have only counterfeited miracles or only

[1] Num. xxi. 6 9; John iii. 14, 15. [2] 2 Kings xviii. 3, 4.

Digitized by Google

pretended to work them. The Egyptian magicians did semblances of the first, second, and third of the miracles done against Pharaoh ;[1] but they did the first by a poor trick, easily comprehensible by jugglers, and much inferior to many modern sleights-of-hand ; they did the second and the third also by poor tricks, easily understood, and manifestly on a very small scale ; they did all the three "with their enchantments ;" they stuck fast at the fourth, could do nothing toward it, and said, "This is the finger of God ;" they made no attempt toward any of the following ones ; and, what is more remarkable than all, they never once tried to remove any of the plagues. What cared Pharaoh for any of the miracles, except that it plagued and punished him and his people ? Had not he plenty of each plague, without desiring any addition to it ? Was not the removal of the plagues the one thing which he wished ? and did he not wish that most earnestly ? and did he not apply to Moses and Aaron to entreat God to do it ? Yet his magicians could do nothing but imitate addition to the plagues ; could not do even that beyond the first three ; could not once try to remove or even diminish a single one. Were these men workers of miracles ? were they any better than sorry jugglers ? The diction of the narrative about them, too, throws light on other passages which speak of signs and wonders as done by men ; for it says, alike concerning their three successful juggleries and concerning their fourth or abortive one, "they did so with their enchantments ;" and then it adds respecting that fourth one, "but they could not." The language is Hebraistic ; and it requires a reader to look at the conditions or at the context in order to see whether it

[1] Exod. vii. 11, 22, viii. 7.

Digitized by Google

denotes a thing done, or whether only the semblance of its being done, or whether even no more than a wish to do it.

Sham miracles and lying wonders were foretold as a characteristic of the antichristian apostasy; and these, according to the Hebraistic idiom, are termed signs and wonders. "There shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." [1] The beast with the two horns like a lamb, which succeeds the beast with seven heads and ten horns, "doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast." [2] The great signs and wonders, in the former of these passages, may be understood as partly physical and partly moral, or as partly factitious prodigies and partly great mental delusions; while the great wonders, the miracles, the making of fire to come down from heaven, in the latter, must, from the character of the context, be understood entirely in the metaphorical or mental sense; and all, as to their utter deceptiousness, or as to their not being true but lying wonders, are explained by the account of "the man of sin, the son of perdition:" "Then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming; even Him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the

[1] Matt. xxiv. 24. [2] Rev. xiii. 11–14.

Digitized by Google

truth, that they might be saved."[1] Most abundantly and terribly have the predictions been fulfilled. Numberless sham miracles and strong delusions have been worked since ever the antichristian apostasy began; and they were always most plentiful and deceptive when the apostasy was at the highest; nor have they ever wanted the awful character of being done under the cloak of Christianity and "in the temple of God." Yet they derogate nothing from the true miracles, any more than a counterfeit coinage derogates from a genuine one; but, on the contrary, they imply the value of the true miracles, by attempting to forge their signature; and they also, though indirectly, corroborate them, by being a fulfilment of predictions embodied among the truths which they attested.

Some persons professing to be Christian teachers and to do miracles, not only have the awful self-deception or the effrontery to maintain their sham to the end of the present life, but will carry it up to the very judgment-seat of Christ. "Many," said He, "will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy name? and in Thy name have cast out devils? and in Thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity."[2] Their whole story is a lie. Their very profession of Christianity is a lie; and, of course, their "many wonderful works" also are lies. Yet they at least have sense enough to know and acknowledge that miracles are to be associated only with the name of Christ. But it may be asked, Did ever any bad men find miracles done, or at least exorcisms effected, through their using the name of Christ? One

[1] 2 Thess. ii. 3–10. [2] Matt. vii. 22, 23.

Digitized by Google

instance is on record, of an attempt at exorcism, with sad disaster to themselves; and it affords a sufficient answer to every form in which the question can be put. "Certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them who had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth. And there were seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, and chief of the priests, who did so. And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye? And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded. And this was known to all the Jews and Greeks dwelling at Ephesus; and fear fell on them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified."[1]

Human workers of wonders were always put into confusion when confronted by miracles. The magicians of Egypt, as we have seen, were so. The magicians of Ephesus also were so. No city was ever more famous than Ephesus for magic, jugglery, false miracle. Ephesian letters, which were charms for the pretended cure of diseases, were long in extensive request, and are frequently mentioned in old writings. Apollonius Tyæneas, one of the most notable magicians known to history, established a school of magic at Ephesus. Diana herself, the great goddess of the Ephesians, was worshipped as a patron of magic. But when "God wrought special miracles by the hand of Paul" at Ephesus, and when the sons of Sceva there were overwhelmed and put to flight in their attempt at exorcism through the name of Jesus, "many of those who used

[1] Acts xix. 12-19.

Digitized by Google

curious arts" in the city, the magicians, the great jugglers, the workers of false miracles, "brought their books together, and burned them before all men; and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver; so mightily grew the word of God and prevailed."[1] Simon of Samaria too, commonly called Simon Magus, or Simon the magician, had similar notoriety, and was similarly discomfited. He had long bewitched the people with sorceries; had long been venerated by them from the least to the greatest; had long given out that himself was some great one, with the result that all said, "This man is the great power of God." But when he saw the miracles which were done through Philip, he was struck with wonder at them, he contemned his own trickeries, he professed to become a believer in the gospel, he joined his own former dupes in renouncing magic and following Philip; and when he afterwards saw "the gifts of the Holy Ghost" conferred on some of the disciples through the laying on of the hands of Peter and John, he felt such admiration of these, was so dazzled by their glory in contrast to human wonders, and had such a passion to be rendered genuinely great by sharing in them, that "he offered money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost;" and so he became for ever notable, first for the utter abasement which human wonder-workers experience in the presence of a miracle, and next for the infamy which covers every man who imagines that spiritual power can be obtained by purchase.[2] Well would it be for all partizans of "lying wonders" in modern times, and well also for their victims, if they would confront their follies with

[1] Acts xix. 19, 20. [2] Acts viii. 5–23.

Digitized by Google

even the mere narratives of the Bible miracles! A minute's earnest comparison would put their delusions to flight. But a thousand-fold well would it be for them, if they would compare the unmeaningness and the sordidness of their own false miracles with the doctrinal glory and the surpassing heavenliness of the true miracles!

Let us, then, go on to consider, as the third great characteristic of the Bible's account of miracles, that they were done in connexion with the reign of Christ, to unfold, attest, or enforce the truths of revelation. They all manifested the perfections of Deity; they all served the same purposes of moral impression and moral teaching as the works of creation and providence; they all held a kindred place to these works in the comprehensive scheme of the mediatorial administration; they all or severally served also specific ends of their own in the development of revelation, or in the successive stages of the fulfilment of the covenant of redemption, on to the close of the ministry of the apostles; and they all lie recorded in the Bible for the convicting of gainsayers and the edifying of believers till the end of time. They were not mere facts, but were enhaloed with doctrine. They did not merely serve a purpose at the times when they were done, but they serve exalted purposes in every age, and are as important now as they were at first. They were not only stupendous displays of Divine power, but they were and are and ever will be glorious manifestations of the grace and love of God in the plan of salvation. To see them aright, you must view them as they were viewed by the enlightened onlookers; you must feel them morally, as they felt them; you must consider their connexions and their teachings; you must read and study the accounts of them, the

Digitized by Google

references to them, the recorded moral effects of them, as integral portions and as aggregately large portions of that scripture which "is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works."[1]

The miracles on behalf of the Israelites, in Egypt and in the wilderness, present many aspects. They were, like all miracles, displays of God's power and holiness and mercy, in connexion with His providence and His moral government, and they are exhibited and celebrated as such in many parts of Scripture. They were done for the Israelites as a typical race, "a holy nation," "a peculiar people;" were done for the fulfilling of the covenant which had been made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with reference to the bestowal of Canaan on their posterity, and to the establishing there of the institutions symbolical of the redemptional work and the spiritual kingdom of the Messiah. They were significant literally for every purpose of that covenant, through all its ages till the Messiah came; and were no less significant typically and doctrinally for the purposes of "the new covenant," which was to be set up when that one should wax old and vanish away, and which is to last till the Messiah come again. They stand forth in many passages of the Old Testament as at once reasons, enforcements, and illustrations of the entire system of truth taught to the successive generations of Israelites, both in connexion with their national polity and through their "house of God," their priesthood, their festivals, and their prefigurative rites and observances. They were engrossed in the inspired expressions of devotion, particularly in the 78th,

[1] 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

Digitized by Google

the 105th, and the 135th Psalms, for the use of the Hebrews through all periods of their commonwealth, and for the use of Christians through all periods of the new economy. The song of Moses recognized substantially all this breadth of import in even the single one of the passage of the Red Sea; sang, in reference to it, "The Lord is my strength and song, and He is become my salvation—He is my God. I will prepare Him an habitation;" sang also, in reference to it, "Who is like unto Thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like Thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in promises, doing wonders?" sang also, in reference to it "Thou in Thy mercy hast led forth the people whom Thou hast redeemed, Thou hast guided them in Thy strength unto Thy holy habitation;" sang also, in reference to it, "The Lord shall reign for ever and ever;"[1] and is conjoined with "the song of the Lamb" in the hymning of seven apocalyptic angels, "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are Thy ways, Thou king of saints; who shall not fear Thee, O Lord, and glorify Thy name? for Thou only art holy; for all nations shall come and worship before Thee; for Thy judgments are made manifest."[2] The miracle of the manna, too, as taught by our Lord Himself, is illustrative of "the bread of God which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world;" of His own flesh and blood, given in sacrifice for the redemption of men; of His own incarnation, substitutionary death, and kingly administration for the eternal saving and sustenance of the souls of His people.[3] Nor only the manna, but also the passage of the Red Sea and the supply of water from the rock, and likewise by implication the other miracles

[1] Exod. xv. 1–19. [2] Rev. xv. 1–4. [3] John vi. 30–58; Rev. ii. 17.

Digitized by Google

in the wilderness, were a typical and a doctrinal exhibition of the facts and influences of the Saviour's life in His people and of His reign over them, all through their way from the Egypt of their former unrenewed condition to the Canaan of their heavenly rest. "I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ." [1]

The miracles done by our Lord manifested His deity, evidenced His Messiahship, and exemplified the power, wisdom, and beneficence of His mediatorial reign. He was "a man approved of God among the Jews by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by Him in the midst of them, as they themselves knew." [2] They often, or even habitually, when they saw His movements and heard His teachings, demanded a miracle in evidence of what He did and taught. "What sign showest Thou unto us," said they, "seeing that Thou doest these things?" [3] "What sign showest Thou then, that we may see and believe Thee? What dost Thou work?" [4] He Himself also referred them to His miracles as evidences of both His Messiahship and his deity. "They came round about Him, and said unto Him, How long dost Thou make us to doubt? If Thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not; the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of Me." [5] "Be-

[1] 1 Cor. x. 1–4. [2] Acts ii. 22. [3] John ii. 18.
[4] John vi. 30. [5] John x. 24, 25.

Digitized by Google

lievest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? The words that I speak unto you I speak not of Myself; but the Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works. Believe Me that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me; or else believe Me for the very work's sake."[1] Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, spoke only the convictions and the common sense of all the sane ones of his people, when he said to Jesus, "Rabbi, we know that Thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that Thou doest, except God be with him."[2] The very chief priests and the Pharisees when met in hostile council against Christ, said, "What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him."[3] Many of the fanatical multitude, at the very time when He was confounding His persecutors by His great public discourses in the temple, and when they sought to put Him down by force, "believed on Him, and said, When Christ cometh, will He do more miracles than this man hath done?"[4] A crowd of them also at Decapolis, after seeing Him cure a deaf and stammering man, and when, remembering other miracles which He had previously worked, "were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well; He maketh both the deaf to hear and the dumb to speak."[5] Amid the national assembly at the feast of the passover, likewise, "many believed in His name, when they saw the miracles which He did."[6] Even at the commencement of His public ministry, when He turned water into wine at a marriage, "this beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth His

[1] John xiv. 10, 11. [2] John iii. 2. [3] John xi. 47, 48.
[4] John vii. 31. [5] Mark vii. 37 [6] John ii. 23.

Digitized by Google

glory; and His disciples believed on Him."[1] A glory of surpassing excellence, the glory of Godhead, of Messiahship, of redemptional administration over men, shone from His miracles at the time when they were done, and will contine to shine from them till the end of the world. We mistake them utterly if we suppose them to have served their purpose only at the moment or only among the men who saw them. We see them in their true character only when we see them to have been done for all generations, and when we feel their influence on our own souls. As with Thomas in seeing the wounds in His hands and side, so with all the right-hearted Jews in seeing the miracles which He did, "because they saw they believed, but blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed."[2] Many of the multitudes who believingly saw the miracles performed, "went back from Christ, and walked no more with Him;"[3] but all the multitude who, on the day of Pentecost, believingly heard Peter's appeal to the miracles as done and past, "gladly received his word, and continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers."[4] And right thinkers now and in every age think and feel as did the believers on the day of Pentecost, They see our Lord's miracles, not singly or as mere stupendous acts, but as a continuous stream of glory and as manifestations of Divine excellence; they see them in connexion with all that He is, with all that He taught, with all that He ever did, all that He is doing now, all that He ever will do; they identify Him essentially and permanently with His works, and His works essentially and permanently with Him; and, contemplating His

[1] John ii. 11. [2] John xx. 29. [3] John vi. 66. [4] Acts ii. 41, 42.

Digitized by Google

course on earth as Immanuel, God with us, they say, "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." [1]

The miracle of our Lord's resurrection, as we have already seen, possesses immense doctrinal value for the whole Christian scheme and for all time. It was the crown of all the miracles both before and after; it concurred with all before, and with all the revelations before, in shedding vast moral influence backward to the time of Adam; and it concurs with all the miracles and revelations after it, in shedding vast moral influence forward till the last day. It confounded the fierce inimical Jewish rulers who dreaded that it might happen, and did the utmost they could to prevent it.[2] It overwhelmed their pitiful hirelings who kept ward at the sepulchre, and who "did shake and became as dead men;" [3] it inspirited the heroic yet trembling women who went early to the sepulchre, and who, when they got assurance there that Jesus had risen, "departed quickly with fear and great joy, and did run to bring His disciples word;".[4] and it became at once and always so prominent and effective a topic of the apostles' preaching that they set it forth "with great power," insomuch that "great grace was upon all who believingly heard them." [5] "The God of our fathers," said they to the very men who had taken part in putting Him to death, "raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree: Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a prince and a saviour, to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins; and we are His

[1] John i. 14. [2] Matt. xxvii. 62–66. [3] Matt. xxviii. 4.
[4] Matt. xxviii. 1–8. [5] Acts iv. 33.

Digitized by Google

witnesses of these things ; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey Him." [1] Nor the raising up of Jesus as a prince and a saviour to the Jews only, but to the Gentiles also ; nor this glorious view of His resurrection as a doctrine of the apostles only, but as a doctrine of Moses and the prophets also. "Having obtained help of God," said Paul before king Agrippa, "I continue unto this day witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come, that Christ should suffer, and that He should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should shew light unto the people and to the Gentiles." [2] The doctrine of Christ's resurrection goes to the very core of all right teaching as to both the redemption of man legally and his salvation spiritually. "We are buried with Him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life ; for if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection. If we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him ; knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more ; death hath no more dominion over Him." [3] His resurrection was His "entering into glory ;" [4] was the lifting up of the everlasting doors that the King of Glory might go in ; [5] was the glorification of Him as Messiah, "with that glory which He had with the Father before the world was ;" [6] was the setting up of the stupendous ladder, for which heaven was open, and on which the angels of

[1] Acts v. 30–32. [2] Acts xxvi. 22, 23. [3] Rom vi. 4–9.
[4] Luke xxiv. 26. [5] Psa. xxiv. 7–10. [6] John xvii. 5.

Digitized by Google

God ascend and descend;[1] was the completed and formal demonstration of His power "to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him."[2] A true view of Christ's resurrection is a view, as to both time and space, through the whole realm of redemption: a view of God's glory, of the Messiah's glory, and of all creatures doing homage to Jesus. "He was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."[3]

The miracles done in connexion with the ministry of the apostles were all bursts of the same moral glory as the central miracle of Christ's resurrection. The first of them, both the commencement and the source of many others, the miraculous descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, when "suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where the disciples were sitting; and there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance;"[4] this was

[1] Gen. xxviii. 12; John i. 51. [2] Rom. viii. 34; Heb. vii. 25.
[3] Phil. ii. 6–11. [4] Acts ii. 2–4.

Digitized by Google

simply the fulfilment of the promise which Christ had given to them: "When the Spirit of truth is come, He shall testify of Me, He shall glorify Me, He shall receive of Mine, and shall shew it unto you."[1] All "the gifts of the Holy Ghost" given then, and given afterwards, directly unfolded, exhibited, and enforced the entire system of truth respecting Christ—the prophecies, the facts, the doctrines, the precepts relative to His redemption of man—in their bearing upon both non-believers and believers, upon both the world and the church;[2] and, like all the other miracles, they not only served their glorious purposes among the men who witnessed them, but continued and will ever continue to serve their purposes till the end of time. "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost;"[3] and no man who overlooks the Holy Spirit's miraculous agency in the apostolic times, or who sees not the bearing of it on living Christianity for all time, can duly understand His work in the scheme of redemption, or His wondrous condescension and grace and love. The commands are as appropriate now as when they were written: "Quench not the Spirit; despise not prophesyings; prove all things; hold fast that which is good."[4] The Holy Spirit, now as then, both through the records of his "gifts" in the Bible and by His ordinary working in the soul, "guides" believers "unto all truth," and takes what is Christ's and shows it to them.[5] And the miracles of all sorts done after the day of Pentecost also showed the Saviour's glory, and exhibited as well as attested the teachings of His gospel. They were done in the name of Jesus;[6] or, as that phrase implies,

[1] John xv. 26, xvi. 14. [2] John xvi. 7–15; 1 Cor. xii. 3–28, xiv. 1–33.
[3] 1 Cor. xii. 3. [4] 1 Thess. v. 19–21. [5] John xvi. 13–15.
[6] Acts iii. 6, 16; iv. 9–12, 30; xvi. 18.

Digitized by Google

they were done in evidence of His mediatorial reign, with accompanying exposition of the truths respecting His person and work, and in sequence of belief of these truths on the part of those who received their benefits. "Be it known unto all you rulers and elders and to all the people of Israel," said Peter respecting one of the earliest of them, "that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."[1] The miracles were accompanied, in all instances, with similar exposition; so that all both attested and exhibited the doctrines of redemption; and they at the same time were the credentials of the apostles in promulging these doctrines among both Jews and Gentiles. "Truly," said Paul to the Greeks, "the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds."[2] No course of mere wonder-working, but a course of continual exhibition of the grace of God in the salvation of men was the entire series of miracles.

"How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will?"[3]

Miracles, then, were very various, ranging from acts resembling acts of providence to acts resembling acts

[1] Acts iv. 10–12. [2] 2 Cor. xii. 12. [3] Heb. ii. 3, 4.

Digitized by Google

of creation, and from physical to mental and moral; they were done directly by God—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and they were done in connexion with the reign of Christ, to unfold, attest, and enforce the truths of revelation. That is the Bible's account of them. It is an account very much larger, of more parts, and with a vastly more glorious character, than is usually assumed in the writings of either friends or foes. It is the only account in which any man can very profitably see them; or in which any theologian can faithfully expound them; or in which any unbeliever can honestly examine them. Any lesser or lower account either deteriorates them, distorts them, or misrepresents them. The true account at once and always shows them in such splendid effulgence as instantly extinguishes all counterfeits; while many a false account so selects the smallest of them and the largest of the counterfeits, so exhibits both as merely wonderful acts, and so excessively obscures the former and brightens the latter, as to bring the two within range of possible comparison. But let the miracles be seen as they are, from providential up to creational, all done directly by God, all manifestative of the glories of redemption, and they inevitably raise in all right hearts what merely one of them was sufficient to raise in the heart of Moses, a surge of devout exclamation, "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like unto thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?" To compare them with even the greatest of the counterfeits is worse than to compare most stupendous truths with most puny lies, or to compare the meridian sun of the tropics with the rushlight of a cavern; it is to compare sublime, magnificent, and glorifying manifestation of realities

Digitized by Google

with drivelling, trickish, and contemptible talk about nonentities.

The miracles, in all instances, were perfectly consistent in themselves, perfectly consistent with the circumstances in which they severally occurred, and perfectly consistent, as we largely argued in our chapter on the Supernatural, with correct notions of the forces miscalled "the laws of nature." They involved no impossibility, no contradiction, no discrepancy or incoherence. Many counterfeits, on the contrary, especially acts of jugglery, by means of imposition, such as the substitution of one thing for another, are as intrinsically absurd as if they professed to make two and two to be five. Again, the miracles did not consist of trivial changes, or present dim and slight appearances, such as a spectator might possibly misconceive; but they comprised changes the most wonderful that could happen, and presented phenomena the most remarkable that could strike the senses or impress the mind. Many counterfeits, on the contrary, such as not a few of those connected with images and relics of saints in Roman Catholic churches, have no more dignity than nursery amusements for children, and far less appearance than the waving of a feather in the air. Again, the miracles were not few, uniform, far between, or of slow performance, but were numerous, various, and frequent, and were done instantaneously, and without the intervention of any second causes. Many counterfeits, on the contrary, such as the stock feats of jugglers and the stock tricks of monks, though often enough shown, are constant repetitions of the same things, in the same way, after studied preparation, and either done gradually or done amidst obvious appliances. Again, the miracles were never spectacular,

Digitized by Google

never done to advertisement, never done at a moment previously fixed, or among persons brought together to see them ; but, though sometimes done in fulfilment of promise or prediction, were always done unexpectedly to observers at junctures of the Divine moral government unforeseen by man, and in connexion with evolutions of revelation which formed epochs of moral influence for all time. Many of the counterfeits, on the contrary, such as the liquefaction of the alleged blood of Januarius at Naples, and the obtaining of the alleged holy fire in the Church of the Sepulchre at Jerusalem, are done on a given day, at a given hour, in given circumstances, exactly like the advertised feats of an acrobat.

Again, the miracles were worked, not in secluded situations, in the presence of few observers, or at a distance from inspection, but in open houses, open streets, or the most public places, in the presence of all sorts of on-lookers, commonly in the view of great mixed multitudes, and always subject to the scrutiny of hostile critics and fierce gainsayers. Many of the counterfeits, on the contrary, claim at the utmost to have been done so obscurely as to at once place, time, and circumstance, that no better account of them can be got than mere rumour, and are supported by no higher witnesses than one or two ignorant, prejudiced, or interested persons. Again, the miracles produced not effects of transient character, or such as might elude subsequent investigation, but effects enduring and distinct, which could at any time for a long period, or by any persons among thousands or millions, be made matter of thorough inquiry and put searchingly to the test. Many of the counterfeits, on the contrary, being nothing in themselves, neither leave nor make a trace of their

Digitized by Google

existence, and can no more be inquired into than the furrow of a ship's keel through a mile of the ocean. Again, the miracles were beneficent and morally glorious; were richly productive of blessings to suffering men, and highly evidential of the gracious government of God in the world; and were done either by the Divine Saviour in the course of His life of humiliation for man's redemption, or in connexion with the self-denied ministry of His prophets and apostles, who "esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches" than all worldly wealth, and "counted not their lives dear unto themselves, so that they might finish their course with joy and testify the gospel of the grace of God."[1] Almost all the counterfeits, on the contrary, have been either worthless or injurious; have done nothing to their dupes but deceive them, delude them, and draw money from them; have shed no influence of any kind except in the direction of folly, superstition, and barbarism; and have been worked and maintained by their promoters only for purposes of gain and of worldly aggrandizement. Again, the miracles were not recorded by distant historians, or published in an age and a country remote from those in which they were performed; but they were recorded by personal witnesses, and published on the spot where they were worked, and among the people who had either seen them or knew well the circumstances connected with them, and who must have possessed all means, if any means could have existed, for questioning or impugning them. The greatest of the counterfeits, on the contrary, such as those ascribed to Pythagoras and Apollonius Tyanæus by the ancient Greeks, and those ascribed to Ignatius

[1] Heb. xi. 26; Acts xx. 24.

Digitized by Google

Loyola and various chief saints by the Roman Catholics, were recorded only by writers who personally knew nothing about them, and only at times and in places far remote from those in which they were alleged to have been done.

Again, the miracles were not recorded formally, as naked facts, or in the way of mere narrative; but were recorded doctrinally, as component parts of the written revelation of the Divine will to man; and they occur to our view, not in sections by themselves, but in interspersion with all sorts of teachings throughout the revelation —not as isolated figures in the fabric, but as a portion of its very warp and woof—and not as things to be seen or contemplated only in the far distance, but as things connected morally and vitally with doctrines as important now as at the first, and with institutions as valuable now as at the first. Nearly all the counterfeits, on the contrary, either are not recorded at all, or are recorded in the way of simply telling a story; give no indication of either showing or reciprocating any grand system of moral truth; have a place only in that sort of literature which is as bleak as a moor or as barren as a desert; and lie even there like grey boulders, affording no relief to the waste.

Again, the miracles are recorded in a manner of Divine simplicity, with a conciseness, a force, a calmness, and a majesty perfectly suited to their own character, and vastly beyond the reach of human contrivance. All the counterfeits, on the contrary, are told in ways of dilatation, complexity, tawdriness, bombast, flourish, or spasm more resembling the puffery of a quack than the tale of a historian.

Finally, the miracles, as we have seen, were all done

Digitized by Google

directly by God. Either they were done, without any medium, by the Father, by the Son, or by the Holy Spirit, or, when men were employed for receiving and conveying communication respecting them, they were declared both by these men themselves and by their own intrinsic character to be done by God. The very "light of the knowledge of the glory of God" common to all true Christians, is described—and much more might the knowledge given to a prophet or an apostle that a miracle was about to be done be described—as "a treasure put into earthen vessels that the excellency of the power might be of God and not of man." [1] The narrative of every miracle, when read rightly, seems as unmistakably the narrative of a Divine work as any statement of the primal creation. All the counterfeits, on the contrary, bear obvious marks of human contrivance; and not a few of them are expressly ascribed to saints, monks, magicians, bones, or rags.

Consider these contrasts collectively, and you will see that miracles and their counterfeits are, in no respect, things to be compared. They are not as great things to small; not even as a sunlike glory to a taper-light; scarcely even as a momentous document to a pitiful forgery. The counterfeits cannot so much as be called imitations. Many of them are "sound and nothing more;" and the rest present no real resemblances to miracles, or at best are resemblances only in name or in dead and toyish miniature. Some are literally non-entities; others mimic miracles in some such way as an orrery mimics the solar system, or as the tiny simulacra of a "Noah's ark" mimic the animal creation; and the greatest are to miracles far less than the candle-lights

[1] 2 Cor. iv. 6, 7.

Digitized by Google

of a Romish church by day are to the sun in the open heavens. They flicker uselessly, in sheer mockery of the sunlight, and serve no purpose but to make you dreamy and superstitious. Extinguish them, and you lose nothing; or if your eye feel momentarily heavy, rub up the windows and you will let in plenteously the pure and true light from the sunny day. Yet they give a lesson in their own character as contrasts. An orrery, though but a few feet of mere mechanism, may suggest to you the wondrous magnificence and stupendous motions of the sun and the planets; the paltry wooden simulacra of a "Noah's ark" may suggest to you, though only by dead outline and by units, the amazing organisms and the vital energies of the animals which plenish the earth; and the little fog flames of the sham wonders in magicians' dens and monks' retreats will serve the only good purpose possible to them, if they suggest to you the glories of God's miracles which shine effulgently in the sky of revelation, and diffuse their light over all the ethereal blue.

The arguments against miracles, that they are contrary to experience or cannot be proved by testimony, is scarcely deserving of notice. It never was thought of till the days of Hume; and it has often been exploded by a power of reasoning incalculably greater than it is worth. What is meant by experience? Is it a man's consciousness about himself or his consciousness about his fellow-men? Hume had no consciousness of the commencement of his existence, that is, no conscious recollection of it. Did he, therefore, never begin to exist? Nor had he any consciousness of the perceptions and thoughts of his fellow-men; he only, from their seeming sameness of nature, inferred that they had per-

Digitized by Google

ceptions and thoughts because he himself had these. Had they, therefore, no perceptions or thoughts, or had they none other than the very ones which he had? Nor, still less, had he any consciousness of the perceptions and thoughts of men in the old times; he only learned both the fact and the character of these by reading about them. Did he therefore not believe that the men in the old times had any perceptions or thoughts? or, when he read that many of these men had seen certain great events, and that multitudes more regarded the events as true, did he not believe them? He did, and readily did, as to the mass of events in the civil history of nations, in the conflicts of armies, and even in the individual conduct of distinguished men. Why, then, did he not believe miracles? These lay recorded before him exactly in the same way as the other events, with the important difference of being authenticated by much better testimony and regarded as true by much better men. Why, then, did he not believe them? Because, said he, no amount of testimony can prove them; all testimony for them is against experience. Yet the experience which he spoke of amounted to no more than his personal consciousness; so that the testimony which he spoke of was no other than such as he himself could give. His argument was simply tantamount to this — *he* had never seen a miracle, and therefore no other person had ever seen a miracle. Never was a more foolish thing put forth by a philosopher. The folly of it, too, was continually exposed in his personal behaviour. He walked through and over his argument, and trampled it in the mud, every hour of his life. He had beliefs in thousands of events on no ground except the same sort of testimony as that for

Digitized by Google

miracles, but on far less of it; and he acted constantly on these beliefs in his writing of the History of England and in all his daily transactions. Nay, he had some beliefs, both strong and steady, against what he called experience, even in the absence of testimony, and for which no testimony could be given. He had beliefs in primal creation and in the origin of forces; or, if he had not, he must have had beliefs in the eternity and the self-existence of both the world and its forces; and he could not, by any possible metaphysical magic, allege respecting either of these sets of beliefs that the things they referred to had anything to do with his experience or with any men's experience. Hume himself, in fact, all infidel though he was, carries us back once more to the initial truths, that the evidences of all great historical events and the evidences of miracles are one, that the proofs of control over forces in inventions and the proofs of control over forces in miracles are one, that the phenomena of unquestioned acts of providence and the phenomena of miracles are one, that the manifestations of Deity in creation and the manifestations of Deity in miracles are one.

Experience rightly understood, or experience in the sense of what multitudes of men in many ages have seen or acted on, is all on the side of miracles. Why are all the early histories of old nations full of prodigies? Why were all the old mythologies packed with superhuman incidents? Why were the old heathens so fond of magic, and so ready to accept its feats? Why are the very modern heathens so universally attached to the use of fetishes? All superstition, you will say. Well, but what is superstition? whence came it? You know it to be nothing else than a corrupted remnant of true

Digitized by Google

religion. It got its radical notion, its belief in Deity, by innate lodgment; it got its notions of sacrifice and propitiation either traditionally from pristine oral revelation, or laterally from communication with holders of the written revelation; it owes nothing to human contrivance except its awful perversions of radical religious thoughts and rites; and it got its universal, strong, dominant notions of the miraculous—whence? Not from human invention, but from the same source as its notions of God, of sacrifice, and of propitiation. Many men saw miracles in the ages of the early revelation; multitudes more, in the same ages and in following ones, knew intimately the circumstances in which the miracles were done, or saw the effects which they produced, and concurred with the actual observers as to both their reality and their gloriousness; and all these, both the many and the multitudes, sent down their belief in them, as from the fountain of a great and long experience, for the benefit of all future generations. Yet portions of the later ones, through degenerating into heathenism, and through a gradual confounding of counterfeit prodigies with true miracles, diluted their testimony so as to render it of less strength than that of their predecessors. But others of the later and of the latest, down to the very times of the last miracles which were done, continued to have the same experience and to maintain the same testimony as the earliest. All the Hebrew people, through their constantly enjoying the light of pure revelation, through their occasionally receiving accessions to it, and through their either living among the very monuments of the miracles or having ready access to them, believed unanimously, in all their generations, that miracles had been done at

Digitized by Google

the founding of their commonwealth, that more had been done in the course of their history, and that still more would be done when the Messiah should appear. Their experience from first to last was an experience broadly for miracles. They had memorials of the old miracles among them at Gilgal and elsewhere; they possessed results of miracles in their very national existence and polity; they rendered their worship for ages toward miraculous manifestations of the Divine presence in their temple; they sang continually of miracles in their holy songs; they either witnessed fresh miracles from time to time in connexion with the ministry of their prophets, or got immediate and sure testimony that such miracles were done; they enjoyed and depended on a special providence whose acts were the same in principle and the same in their estimation as miraculous acts; and, at the appearance of Jesus of Nazareth, on His claiming to be the Messiah, not a few of those then alive expected or demanded that He should make good His claim by working miracles, while the very chief of such as most bitterly opposed Him admitted that He did work miracles. Religion and miracles, providence and miracles, the Divine government and miracles, could not be conceived apart from each other by the Hebrews. Their experiences and their thoughts were full of miracles, just as their scriptures were full of them. Their enemies, too, the Philistines, the Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Romans, and others, saw some of the miracles which were done in connexion with their religion, and were confirmed by these in their previous common belief in the miraculous. The very opponents of Christianity, amid the tumults of its onsets against the gods of Greece and Rome,

Digitized by Google

even though these opponents included men of highest mark for intellect and erudition, never questioned the principle of its miracles, never attempted to cut away from it the old Hebrew miracles to which it appealed, never impugned its subjective claim to embody miracles or to hold them out as credentials, but merely impugned the particular miracles of it which were proclaimed, or called in question the particular testimony for them which was furnished. Thus were all mankind, down to the time of the latest miracles being done, concurrent in setting forth their experience as on the side of miracles.

Nor could their experience have been otherwise. Miracles were a necessity for men. Revelation was a necessity for them; and miracles went necessarily along with revelation. The necessity of revelation can be shown from numerous arguments too long to be noticed here. But how was revelation to be given, and how recognized? Had it been given to every man individually, it would have been a miracle to every man, would have been recognized as a miracle by every man, and would therefore have been self-attested to every man. But as it was given to only a very few men as mediums for all the rest, it stood self-attested to only these very few, and required credentials for all the rest. How were they to know that any persons professing to communicate a revelation to them were not impostors or fanatics—were not either fabricators of what they announced or victims of a heated imagination? How else than by physical miracles? Revelation is a mental miracle recognizable only, though readily and fully, by the individual who receives it; a stupendous visible act of any such kind as only Divine agency can

Digitized by Google

do, is a physical miracle recognizable instantly and completely by any ordinary men; and the two things, the revelation and the physical miracle, are identical in agency, both of them by God, each the complement of the other, the two mutually related somewhat like mind and body in one creature, in one act, from the one Creator. Miracles, therefore, attested revelation; manifested it; made it recognizable, distinctly and unmistakably, by any number of ordinary observers. And, as revelation was a necessity for men, so miracles were a necessity for men.

Yet they were not a compulsion; they were not a fate; they did not destroy or overpower men's free will; they were in perfect harmony with all the things miscalled "natural laws," or with all the mental and moral forces as well as with all the physical ones. The evidence they gave could not be denied, but it might be evaded, gainsaid, resisted. "What do we?" said the inveterately perverse chief priests and Pharisees respecting Christ, "for this man doeth many miracles; if we let him thus alone, all men will believe on Him."[1] They even went so far, in regard to His casting out of devils, as to ascribe the power, not to Him, but to the prince of the devils.[2] But they, in that instance, simply tried to fix attention on the notion of devils—simply laboured to shut out of view the manifest Divine beneficence of what was done; they also, even in that instance, with all aid of their prodigious perversity, made no attempt to deny that what was done was superhuman—or rather, they merely tried, in the manner of the Baal-worship of many of their ancestors, to transfer it from the true God to a false god; and they never, in any other in-

[1] John xi. 47, 48. [2] Matt. xii. 24–30.

Digitized by Google

stance, questioned either the fact, the beneficence, the Divine working, or the evidential power of our Lord's miracles. They merely evaded their evidence; and they both acknowledged and feared that few of their countrymen would or could evade it. But they were very peculiar persons. They already held revelation, were well acquainted with revelation, and knew and acknowledged it to be revelation; and they first perverted that—had long and habitually perverted it, sought their worldly interests and honours in perverting it; and now, as a matter of course, they resisted and perverted the miraculous evidence given for illustrating and extending it. Theirs was exactly the case delineated in one of the parables, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rise from the dead."[1] Nor is the case of modern sceptics much different. They, too, have been acquainted with revelation, and have despised it; and they are only too consistent in struggling to get rid of miracles. But "what would become of the scepticisms of a Hume or a Voltaire, should he go to the grave where a father or brother had been buried for years, and see him wake up to life and come forth at the word of a Divine messenger? What will become of his scepticism when he himself, after having slept in death thousands of years, shall rise from the dead, and shall see others rise around him?"

Miracles thus appear concurrent with revelation, and lead contemplation onward to the last day. They were an integral part of the one comprehensive course of Divine operation; and they held when performed, and continue to hold by their influence, as essential a place

[1] Luke xvi. 31.

Digitized by Google

in it as either revelation or providence. The mediatorial reign, as we saw in our chapter on Creation, pervades the whole course, or rather is identical with it; and it includes, in continuous stream, from one source and toward one end, primal creation, special creation, providence, revelation, miracles, and the unfolding, carrying on, and completing of the scheme of redemption. None of these could be a-wanting; no more providence and miracles than creation and revelation. No one of them could be without all the others. Nor, especially, could either special creation, providence, revelation, or miracles be a-wanting towards the glorious climax of the whole in the actual redemptional work done in the incarnation, sacrifice, resurrection, and exaltation of the Saviour. Miracle was both essentially precurrent to that work, and essentially existent in it. The entire scheme of salvation, indeed, both in the divulgement of it and in the execution of it, was essentially miraculous. The first revelation of it was miracle; the successive and augmentative revelations of it were miracles in themselves, and involved attestation by miracles; the actual work of it in the advent, life, death, resurrection, and glorification of the Son of God, was a series of stupendous miracles; and the promulgation of it after His ascension was all essentially a vast moral miracle in itself, and involved an accompaniment of physical miracles. A book of oracles from God, without a concomitancy of miracles in the giving of it, and without teachings by miracles throughout it, would have been an impossibility; and anything pretending to be such a book without these, would have been, on the very face of it, a monstrous self-contradiction. Persons who appeal from the Bible to miracles and from miracles to

Digitized by Google

the Bible have been accused of reasoning in a circle; but they no more reason in a circle than persons who appeal from green to yellow and from yellow to green as both contained in any one ray of light from the sun. Nor, as to the principle of miracles, are they any less identical with anything whatever which God has done. All His works are strictly His own, strictly Divine, immensely beyond any created agency to do, and entirely the same in principle as all His miracles were. Primal creation, every special creation, the heavens above, the earth beneath, man himself, and the courses of providence over man and around him, are all in the category of God's "wondrous works." The sceptic who scouts the principle of a miracle will never be logical till he scouts the principle of his own existence; and the half-believer who acknowledges the glory of a miracle will never be consistent till he acknowledges a kindred glory through all the works of the Most High. "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised; and His greatness is unsearchable. One generation shall praise Thy works to another, and shall declare Thy mighty acts. I will speak of the glorious honour of Thy majesty, and of Thy wondrous works. And men shall speak of the might of Thy terrible acts; and I will declare Thy greatness."[1] "Who can utter the mighty acts of the Lord? who can show forth all his praise?"[2]

[1] Psa. cxlv. 3–6. [2] Psa. cvi. 2.

UNWIN BROTHERS, THE GRESHAM PRESS, CHILWORTH AND LONDON.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google